arXiv:1010.0618v1 [math.AP] 4 Oct 2010

Isolatedness of characteristic points at blow-up for a semilinear wave equation in one space dimension [*]

Frank Merle
Université de Cergy Pontoise and IHES
Hatem Zaag
CNRS LAGA Université Paris 13

October 4, 2010

Abstract: We consider the semilinear wave equation with power nonlinearity in one space dimension. We consider an arbitrary blow-up solution $u(x,t)$, the graph $x \mapsto T(x)$ of its blow-up points and $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathbb{R}$ the set of all characteristic points. We show that $\mathcal{S}$ is locally finite.

MSC 2010 Classification: 35L05, 35L71, 35L67, 35B44, 35B40

Keywords: Wave equation, characteristic point, blow-up set.

1 Introduction

1.1 Main results

We consider the one dimensional semilinear wave equation

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t^2 u = \partial_x^2 u + |u|^{p-1}u, \\ u(0) = u_0 \text{ and } u_t(0) = u_1, \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

where $u(t) : x \in \mathbb{R} \to u(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}$, $p > 1$, $u_0 \in \mathrm{H}^1_{\mathrm{loc,u}}$ and $u_1 \in \mathrm{L}^2_{\mathrm{loc,u}}$ with $\|v\|^2_{\mathrm{L}^2_{\mathrm{loc,u}}} = \sup\limits_{a\in\mathbb{R}} \int_{|x-a|<1} |v(x)|^2 dx$ and $\|v\|^2_{\mathrm{H}^1_{\mathrm{loc,u}}} = \|v\|^2_{\mathrm{L}^2_{\mathrm{loc,u}}} + \|\nabla v\|^2_{\mathrm{L}^2_{\mathrm{loc,u}}}$.
We solve equation (1.1) locally in time in the space $\mathrm{H}^1_{\mathrm{loc,u}} \times \mathrm{L}^2_{\mathrm{loc,u}}$ (see Ginibre, Soffer and Velo [7], Lindblad and Sogge [14]). For the existence of blow-up solutions, we have the following blow-up criterion from Levine [13]: If $(u_0, u_1) \in H^1 \times L^2(\mathbb{R})$ satisfies

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\frac{1}{2}|u_1(x)|^2 + \frac{1}{2}|\partial_x u_0(x)|^2 - \frac{1}{p+1}|u_0(x)|^{p+1} \right) dx < 0,$$

then the solution of (1.1) cannot be global in time. More blow-up results can be found in Caffarelli and Friedman [5], [4], Alinhac [1], [2] and Kichenassamy and Littman [11], [12].

---

[*] Both authors are supported by a grant from the french Agence Nationale de la Recherche, project ONDENONLIN, reference ANR-06-BLAN-0185.

If u is a blow-up solution of (1.1), we define (see for example Alinhac [1]) a 1-Lipschitz curve $\Gamma = \{(x, T(x))\}$ such that the maximal influence domain D of u (or the domain of definition of u) is written as

$$D = \{(x,t) \mid t < T(x)\}. \tag{1.2}$$

$\bar{T} = \inf_{x\in\mathbb{R}} T(x)$ and Γ are called the blow-up time and the blow-up graph of u. A point x_0 is a non characteristic point if

$$\text{there are } \delta_0 \in (0,1) \text{ and } t_0 < T(x_0) \text{ such that } u \text{ is defined on } \mathcal{C}_{x_0,T(x_0),\delta_0} \cap \{t \geq t_0\} \tag{1.3}$$

where $\mathcal{C}_{\bar{x},\bar{t},\bar{\delta}} = \{(x,t) \mid t < \bar{t} - \bar{\delta}|x - \bar{x}|\}$. We denote by $\mathcal{R}$ (resp. $\mathcal{S}$) the set of non characteristic (resp. characteristic) points.

In Proposition 1 in [17], we proved the *existence of solutions* of (1.1) such that

$$\mathcal{S} \neq \emptyset.$$

For general blow-up solutions, we proved the following facts about $\mathcal{R}$ and $\mathcal{S}$ in [16] and [17] (see Theorem 1 (and the following remark) in [16], see Propositions 5 and 8 in [17]):

(i) $\mathcal{R}$ *is a non empty open set, and* $x \mapsto T(x)$ *is of class* C^1 *on* $\mathcal{R}$*;*
(ii) $\mathcal{S}$ *is a closed set with empty interior, and given* $x_0 \in \mathcal{S}$*, if* $0 < |x - x_0| \leq \delta_0$*, then*

$$0 < T(x) - T(x_0) + |x - x_0| \leq \frac{C_0|x - x_0|}{|\log(x - x_0)|^{\frac{(k(x_0)-1)(p-1)}{2}}} \tag{1.4}$$

for some $\delta_0 > 0$ *and* $C_0 > 0$*, where* $k(x_0) \geq 2$ *is an integer. Moreover,* $x \mapsto T(x)$ *is left-differentiable and right-differentiable, with* $T_l'(x_0) = 1$ *and* $T_r'(x_0) = -1$*.*

Following our earlier work [17], we aim in this paper at proving that $\mathcal{S}$ is made of isolated points. We have the following theorem, which is the main result of our analysis:

Theorem 1 ($\mathcal{S}$ is made of isolated points) *Consider* $u(x,t)$ *a blow-up solution of (1.1). The set of characteristic points* $\mathcal{S}$ *is made of isolated points.*

Remark: The fact that the elements of $\mathcal{S}$ are isolated points is not elementary. Direct arguments give no more than the fact that $\mathcal{S} \neq \mathbb{R}$ (a point x_0 such that $T(x_0)$ is the blow-up time is non characteristic). The first step of the proof has been done in [17] where we proved that $\mathcal{S}$ has an empty interior and that in similarity variables, the solution splits in a non trivial decoupled sum of (at least 2) solitons with alternate signs (see Proposition 1.3 below for a statement). The second step is the heart of the present paper. It consists in using this decomposition and a good understanding of the dynamics of the equation in similarity variables (see equation (1.7) below) near a decoupled sum of "generalized" solitons. More details on the strategy of the proof can be found in Section 1.3 below. In fact, this is the first time where flows near an unstable sum of solitons are used and where such a result is obtained.

Remark: In higher dimensions $N \geq 2$, our result would be that the $(N-1)$-dimensional Hausdorff measure of S is bounded. To prove that, we strongly need to characterize all selfsimilar solutions of equation (1.1) in the energy space. This is the main obstruction to

extend this result to higher dimensions.
Similar results are already available in the context of blow-up solutions for the semilinear heat equation with a subcritical power nonlinearity. They are due to Velázquez who proved in [20] that the $(N-1)$-Hausdorff dimension of the blow-up set is bounded. His proof is based on energy arguments and the "infinite speed of propagation". Note that in that parabolic case, there is only one value for the local energy limit at blow-up points, and this value is higher than the local energy limit at non blow-up points. Therefore, in order to conclude in [20], it was enough to compute directly the local energy at nearby points in well chosen directions. As we said earlier, the local energy limit at blow-up has only one value, whether the blow-up behavior is stable or unstable. Only the speed of convergence to the profile is different between the stable and the unstable behaviors. Here, with equation (1.1) which is hyperbolic, the argument cannot be as direct. This is due to two reasons:
- the unstable behavior (near characteristic points) and the stable behavior (near non characteristic points) have different energy levels (see Propositions 1.2 and 1.3 below);
- we need information outside the light cone, which is beyond the reach of the finite speed of propagation. See Section 1.3 for more details on the proof.

Remark: The fact that $\mathcal{S}$ is made of isolated points certainly does not hold in general for quasilinear wave equations. Indeed, in [3], Alinhac gives an explicit solution $u(x,t)$ for the following nonlinear wave equation

$$\partial_t^2 u = \partial_x^2 u + \partial_x u \partial_t u,$$

whose domain of definition is

$$D = \mathbb{R} \times [0,\infty) \backslash \{(x,t) \mid t \geq 1,\ |x| \leq t-1\}$$

(when $0 \leq t < 1$, $u(x,t) = 4\arctan\left(\frac{x}{1-t}\right)$). In this example, we clearly see that $\mathcal{R} = \{0\}$, $\mathcal{S} = \mathbb{R}^*$, and the boundary of D is characteristic (i.e. has slope ±1) on $\mathcal{S}$.

We also have the following estimate of the blow-up set, which improves (1.4) proved in [17]:

Theorem 2 (Description of $T(x)$ for x near x_0) *If $x_0 \in \mathcal{S}$ and $0 < |x-x_0| \leq \delta_0$, then*

$$\frac{1}{C_0 |\log(x-x_0)|^{\frac{(k(x_0)-1)(p-1)}{2}}} \leq T'(x) + \frac{x-x_0}{|x-x_0|} \leq \frac{C_0}{|\log(x-x_0)|^{\frac{(k(x_0)-1)(p-1)}{2}}}$$

for some $\delta_0 > 0$ and $C_0 > 0$, where $k(x_0) \geq 2$ is an integer.

Remark: Integrating the estimate of Theorem 2, we see that

$$\frac{|x-x_0|}{C_0 |\log(x-x_0)|^{\frac{(k(x_0)-1)(p-1)}{2}}} \leq T(x) - T(x_0) + |x-x_0| \leq \frac{C_0|x-x_0|}{|\log(x-x_0)|^{\frac{(k(x_0)-1)(p-1)}{2}}}. \quad (1.5)$$

The upper bound in this estimate was already known in [17]. On the contrary, the lower bound (which is of the same size) is a new contribution in this work. Moreover, both the lower and the upper bounds on $T'(x)$ are new. There is also a dynamical version for

this result, where we find the convergence of the similarity variables version $w_x(y,s)$ to $\kappa(T'(x),\cdot)$ (respectively defined in (1.6) and (1.13) below), with a speed controlled in terms of x near x_0 (see the proof of Theorem 2 in Section 3 for more details). This also provides the behavior (or the "picture") of $u(x,t)$ for (x,t) close to $(x_0,T(x_0))$, even outside the backward light cone of vertex $(x_0,T(x_0))$. For a similar result where the picture of the solution is derived near the singularity for the semilinear heat equation, see Herrero and Velázquez [8], [9] and Fermanian, Merle and Zaag [6] for the case of an isolated blow-up point, see also Velázquez [18], [19], Zaag [21], [22], [24], [23] and Khenissy, Rebai and Zaag [10] for the case of non isolated blow-up points.
Remark: From the shape of the solution near $(x_0,T(x_0))$, we can recover the topology of the solution. Indeed, the shape gives the integer $k(x_0)\geq 2$, and $k(x_0)-1$ is the number of sign changes of the solution near $(x_0,T(x_0))$ as shown in Proposition 1.3 below.

As a consequence of our analysis, particularly the lower bound on $T(x)$ in (1.5), we have the following corollary on the blow-up speed in the backward light cone with vertex $(x_0,T(x_0))$ where x_0 is a characteristic point.

Corollary 1.1 (Blow-up speed at a characteristic point) *For all $x_0\in\mathcal{S}$ and $t\in[0,T(x_0))$, we have*

$$\frac{|\log(T(x_0)-t)|^{\frac{k(x_0)-1}{2}}}{C(T(x_0)-t)^{\frac{2}{p-1}}}\leq \sup_{|x-x_0|<T(x_0)-t}|u(x,t)|\leq \frac{C|\log(T(x_0)-t)|^{\frac{k(x_0)-1}{2}}}{(T(x_0)-t)^{\frac{2}{p-1}}}.$$

Remark: Note that by definition of the maximal influence domain (or the domain of definition) D of u in (1.2), we don't even know whether the solution blows up on the boundary Γ of D. In other words, given $x_0\in\mathbb{R}$, we don't know whether $\sup_{|x-x_0|<T(x_0)-t}|u(x,t)|\to\infty$ as $t\to T(x_0)$. When $x_0\in\mathcal{R}$, this fact follows from our convergence result to the profile proved in [15] (see Corollary 4 page 49 there). When $x_0\in\mathcal{S}$, the same fact holds, as one may derive from the corollary above. However, this latter case needs much more work (involving 3 papers [15], [17] and the present one), based on the decomposition into a decoupled sum of solitons (see Proposition 1.3 below for a statement). Now, if we refine this result, we will see that there is a difference in the size of the L^∞ norm, whether $x_0\in\mathcal{R}$ or $x_0\in\mathcal{S}$. Indeed, Since $k(x_0)\geq 2$ when $x_0\in\mathcal{S}$, it is clear from this corollary that the blow-up speed in L^∞ is higher than the case when $x_0\in\mathcal{R}$ where the rate is a given by the associated ODE:

$$\frac{(T(x_0)-t)^{-\frac{2}{p-1}}}{C}\leq \sup_{|x-x_0|<T(x_0)-t}|u(x,t)|\leq C(T(x_0)-t)^{-\frac{2}{p-1}}$$

(see Corollary 4 page 49 in [15] for an argument). Note that the same analysis can be carried out with the H^1 norm (averaged on the section of the light cone) instead of the L^∞, leading to the same results.

1.2 Formulation in similarity variables

Let us recall in the following the similarity variables and some energy estimates from our earlier work.

Given some $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, a natural tool is to introduce the following change of variables:

$$w_{x_0}(y,s) = (T(x_0)-t)^{\frac{2}{p-1}} u(x,t), \quad y = \frac{x-x_0}{T(x_0)-t}, \quad s = -\log(T(x_0)-t). \tag{1.6}$$

The function $w = w_{x_0}$ satisfies the following equation for all $y \in (-1,1)$ and $s \geq -\log T(x_0)$:

$$\partial_s^2 w = \mathcal{L}w - \frac{2(p+1)}{(p-1)^2} w + |w|^{p-1}w - \frac{p+3}{p-1}\partial_s w - 2y\partial^2_{y,s} w \tag{1.7}$$

$$\text{where } \mathcal{L}w = \frac{1}{\rho}\partial_y\left(\rho(1-y^2)\partial_y w\right) \text{ and } \rho(y) = (1-y^2)^{\frac{2}{p-1}}. \tag{1.8}$$

Introducing $V = (V_1, V_2) = (w, \partial_s w)$, we rewrite (1.7) as a first order equation

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial s}\begin{pmatrix} V_1 \\ V_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} V_2 \\ \mathcal{L}V_1 - \frac{2(p+1)}{(p-1)^2}V_1 + |V_1|^{p-1}V_1 - \frac{p+3}{p-1}V_2 - 2y\partial_y V_2 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{1.9}$$

Introducing

$$\mathcal{H} = \left\{(q_1,q_2) \mid \|(q_1,q_2)\|^2_{\mathcal{H}} \equiv \int_{-1}^{1}\left(q_1^2 + \left(q_1'\right)^2(1-y^2) + q_2^2\right)\rho dy < +\infty\right\}, \tag{1.10}$$

$$\mathcal{H}_0 = \{q_1 \mid \|q_1\|^2_{\mathcal{H}_0} \equiv \int_{-1}^{1}\left(q_1^2 + \left(q_1'\right)^2(1-y^2)\right)\rho dy < +\infty\}, \tag{1.11}$$

we see that the Lyapunov functional for equation (1.9)

$$E(V) = \int_{-1}^{1}\left(\frac{1}{2}V_2^2 + \frac{1}{2}\left(\partial_y V_1\right)^2(1-y^2) + \frac{(p+1)}{(p-1)^2}V_1^2 - \frac{1}{p+1}|V_1|^{p+1}\right)\rho dy \tag{1.12}$$

is defined for $V = (V_1, V_2) \in \mathcal{H}$. When there is no ambiguity, we may write $E(w)$ instead of $E(w, \partial_s w)$.

Let us now introduce for all $|d| < 1$ the following stationary solutions of (1.7) (or solitons) defined by

$$\kappa(d,y) = \kappa_0 \frac{(1-d^2)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}}{(1+dy)^{\frac{2}{p-1}}} \text{ where } \kappa_0 = \left(\frac{2(p+1)}{(p-1)^2}\right)^{\frac{1}{p-1}} \text{ and } |y| < 1. \tag{1.13}$$

Furthermore, we introduce the following family of explicit solutions of equation (1.7) (related to $\kappa(d,y)$ (1.13) by the selfsimilar transformation (1.6)) defined by

$$\kappa_1^*(d, \mu e^s, y) = \kappa_0 \frac{(1-d^2)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}}{(1+dy+\mu e^s)^{\frac{2}{p-1}}}.$$

Note that $\kappa_1^*(d, \mu e^s, y) \to \kappa(d)$ in $\mathcal{H}$ as $s \to -\infty$. Moreover ,
- when $\mu = 0$, we recover the stationary solutions $\kappa(d)$ defined in (1.13);
- when $\mu > 0$, the solution exists for all $(y,s) \in (-1,1) \times \mathbb{R}$ and converges to 0 in $\mathcal{H}$ as

$s \to \infty$ (it is a heteroclinic connection between $\kappa(d)$ and 0);
- when $\mu < 0$, the solution exists for all $(y,s) \in (-1,1) \times \left(-\infty, \log\left(\frac{|d|-1}{\mu}\right)\right)$ and blows up at time $s = \log\left(\frac{|d|-1}{\mu}\right)$.

We also introduce for all $d \in (-1,1)$ and $\nu > -1+|d|$, $\kappa^*(d,\nu,y) = (\kappa_1^*, \kappa_2^*)(d,\nu,y)$ where

$$\kappa_1^*(d,\nu,y) = \kappa_0 \frac{(1-d^2)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}}{(1+dy+\nu)^{\frac{2}{p-1}}}, \quad \kappa_2^*(d,\nu,y) = \nu\partial_\nu \kappa_1^*(d,\nu,y) = -\frac{2\kappa_0\nu}{p-1}\frac{(1-d^2)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}}{(1+dy+\nu)^{\frac{p+1}{p-1}}}. \tag{1.14}$$

In our paper, we refer to these functions as "generalized solitons" or solitons for short. Note that for any $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$, $\kappa^*(d, \mu e^s, y)$ is a solution to equation (1.9). In Lemma A.2 in Appendix A below, we give some properties of $\kappa^*(d,\nu,y)$.

Now, we recall the following results on non characteristic points:

Proposition 1.2 (Case of non characteristic points)
(i) **(Energy level criterion for $\mathcal{R}$)** *If for some x_0 and $s_0 \ge -\log T(x_0)$, we have*

$$E(w_{x_0}(s_0)) < 2E(\kappa_0),$$

then $x_0 \in \mathcal{R}$.
(ii) **(A trapping criterion for $\mathcal{R}$)** *There exist $\epsilon_0 > 0$ and $C_0 > 0$ such that if for some $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, $s_0 \ge -\log T(x)$, $\theta = \pm 1$, $d \in (-1,1)$ and $\epsilon \in (0,\epsilon_0]$, we have*

$$\left\| \begin{pmatrix} w_{x_0}(s_0) \\ \partial_s w_{x_0}(s_0) \end{pmatrix} - \theta \begin{pmatrix} \kappa(d) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\|_{\mathcal{H}} \le \epsilon, \tag{1.15}$$

then $x_0 \in \mathcal{R}$ and $|\operatorname{argth} T'(x_0) - \operatorname{argth} d| \le C_0\epsilon$. Moreover, for all $s \ge s_0$:

$$\left\| \begin{pmatrix} w_{x_0}(s) \\ \partial_s w_{x_0}(s) \end{pmatrix} - \theta \begin{pmatrix} \kappa(T'(x_0)) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\|_{\mathcal{H}} \le C_0 e^{-\mu_0(s-s_0)}$$

for some positive μ_0 and C_0 independent from x_0.
(iii) There exist $\mu_0 > 0$ and $C_0 > 0$ such that for all $x_0 \in \mathcal{R}$, there exist $\theta(x_0) = \pm 1$ and $s_0(x_0) \ge -\log T(x_0)$ such that for all $s \ge s_0$:

$$\left\| \begin{pmatrix} w_{x_0}(s) \\ \partial_s w_{x_0}(s) \end{pmatrix} - \theta(x_0) \begin{pmatrix} \kappa(T'(x_0)) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\|_{\mathcal{H}} \le C_0 e^{-\mu_0(s-s_0)}. \tag{1.16}$$

Moreover, $E(w_{x_0}(s)) \to E(\kappa_0)$ as $s \to \infty$.

Remark: The notation argth stands for the inverse of the hyperbolic tangent function.
Proof: All these results have been proved in [15], [16] and [17]. For the reader's convenience, we indicate where the proofs can be found in those papers:
(i) See Corollary 7 in [17].
(ii) Since we proved in Corollary 7 in [17] that

$$\forall x_0 \in \mathbb{R}, \ \ \forall s \ge -\log T(x_0), \ \ E(w_{x_0}(s)) \ge E(\kappa_0) \tag{1.17}$$

(this comes actually from the monotonicity of $E(w)$ and the convergence in (iii) of this proposition and Proposition 1.3 below), our statement follows from Theorem 3 page 48 in [15], (i) of this proposition and Theorem 1 page 58 in [16].
(iii) See Corollary 4 page 49, Theorem 3 page 48 in [15] and Theorem 1 page 58 in [16].■

Now, we recall our results for characteristic points:

Proposition 1.3 (Case of characteristic points) *If $x_0 \in \mathcal{S}$, then it holds that*

$$\left\| \begin{pmatrix} w_{x_0}(s) \\ \partial_s w_{x_0}(s) \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} \sum_{i=1}^{k(x_0)} \theta_i \kappa(d_i(s)) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\|_{\mathcal{H}} \to 0 \text{ and } E(w_{x_0}(s)) \to k(x_0)E(\kappa_0) \qquad (1.18)$$

as $s \to \infty$, for some

$$k(x_0) \geq 2, \;\; \theta_i = \theta_1(-1)^{i+1}$$

and continuous $d_i(s) = -\tanh \zeta_i(s) \in (-1,1)$ for $i = 1, ..., k(x_0)$. Moreover, for some $C_0 > 0$, for all $i = 1, ..., k(x_0)$ and s large enough, we have

$$\left| \zeta_i(s) - \left(i - \frac{(k(x_0)+1)}{2} \right) \frac{(p-1)}{2} \log s \right| \leq C_0. \qquad (1.19)$$

Remark: The integer $k(x_0) \geq 2$ has a geometrical interpretation: it appears also in the upper bound estimate on $T(x)$ for x near x_0 given in (1.4).

1.3 The strategy of the proof

In the following, we will explain the strategy of the proof of Theorems 1 and 2 and Corollary 1.1. Consider $u(x,t)$ a blow-up solution of equation (1.1) and $x_0 \in \mathcal{S}$. The decomposition of $w_{x_0}(y,s)$ is given in Proposition 1.3 (up to replacing $u(x,t)$ by $-u(x,t)$, we may assume that $\theta_1 = -1$).

To prove that x_0 is an isolated characteristic point, the only tools we have are the energy criterion and the trapping result of (i) and (ii) in Proposition 1.2. In order to use these tools, we have to find the behavior of w_x for x near x_0. A simple idea for that is to start from the decomposition (1.18) for w_{x_0} and the fact that the blow-up set is locally different from a straight line (it is in fact corner shaped; see the result of [17] stated in (1.4)), and use the transformation (1.6) first to recover the behavior of $u(x,t)$, then the behavior of $w_x(y,s)$ for x near x_0. Two problems arise in this simple idea:

- we can't have information on $w_x(y,s)$ for all $y \in (-1,1)$, since information on the whole interval $(-1,1)$ would involve information on $w_{x_0}(y,s)$ for $|y| \geq 1$, and this is unavailable (at least at time s) because of the finite speed of propagation;

- the relation between w_{x_0} and w_x we get from (1.6) depends explicitly on the value of $T(x)$ which is an unknown. The value of $T(x)$ specified by the range in (1.4) changes the range of s for which we have information.

To overcome these problems, we first use (1.18) and continuity arguments to show that for x close enough to x_0 and $s = L_{m+1}$ large enough, w_x is close to a sum of k solitons

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k} (-1)^i \kappa_1^*(\bar{d}_i(L_{m+1}), \bar{\nu}_i(L_{m+1}))$$

where κ_1^* is defined in (1.14). Remember that $\kappa_1^*(d, \pm e^s)$ are heteroclinic orbits connecting $\kappa(d)$ to 0 or to ∞. Here, we are going to use essential facts of the theory of "solitons", namely that this decomposition is stable in time as time increases and that there are no collisions between them. Then, the idea is to use the equation (1.6) satisfied by w_x to propagate this decomposition from $s = L_{m+1}$ to $|\log|x - x_0|| + L$ where L is large, and prove (roughly speaking) the following (see Proposition 3.1 below for a precise statement):

$$\sup_{L_{m+1} \le s \le |\log|x-x_0||+L} \left\| \begin{pmatrix} w_x(s) \\ \partial_s w_x(s) \end{pmatrix} - \sum_{i=1}^{k} (-1)^i \kappa^* \left(\bar{d}_i(s), \bar{\nu}_i(s)\right) \right\|_{\mathcal{H}} \to 0 \tag{1.20}$$

as $L_0 \to \infty$, $L \to \infty$ and $x \to x_0$ for some parameters $(\bar{d}_i(s), \bar{\nu}_i(s))$.
Then, it happens that at time $s = |\log|x - x_0|| + L$, all the solitons $\kappa^*(\bar{d}_i(s), \bar{\nu}_i(s))$ for $i = 2, ..., k$ become small (or vanish) for L large and $|x - x_0|$ small (see Claim 3.4 for a precise statement), so that only the first soliton is left in (1.20). This crucial property is derived from the decomposition of $w_{x_0}(y, s)$ given in Proposition 1.3 and the relation between w_{x_0} and w_x derived from (1.6). Since

$$\forall s \ge -\log T(x), \quad E(w_x(s)) \ge E(\kappa_0)$$

(see (1.17)), the first soliton has to be a pure soliton of the form $-\kappa(\bar{d}_1^*, 0)$ given in (1.13), for some explicit $\bar{d}_1^* = \bar{d}_1^*(x)$, leading to the following estimate:

$$\left\| \begin{pmatrix} w_x(s^*) \\ \partial_s w_x(s^*) \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} \kappa\left(\bar{d}_1^*\right) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\|_{\mathcal{H}} \le \epsilon_0 \text{ where } s^* = |\log|x - x_0|| + L$$

and $\epsilon_0 > 0$ is defined in the trapping result stated in (ii) of Proposition 1.2. Applying that trapping result, we derive two facts:
- the point x is non characteristic (this is the conclusion of Theorem 1);
- the slope $T'(x)$ satisfies $|\operatorname{argth} T'(x) - \operatorname{argth} \bar{d}_1^*(x)| \le C\epsilon_0$, which gives the desired estimate in Theorem 2. By integration, we get the approximation for $T(x)$ stated in (1.5). Thus, we reach the conclusions of Theorems 1 and 2. As for corollary 4, it simply follows from the estimates used for Theorems 1 and 2, as we will see in the short section 3.3 below.

In conclusion, two ideas are crucial in the propagation technique which yields (1.20):

- the sum of k solitons $\kappa^*(\bar{d}_i, \bar{\nu}_i)$ is stable in time if they do not collide (that is when $|\operatorname{argth} \frac{\bar{\nu}_{i+1}}{1+\bar{d}_{i+1}} - \operatorname{argth} \frac{\bar{\nu}_i}{1+\bar{d}_i}|$ is large);

- the partial information we get from the simple idea based on the algebraic transformation from w_{x_0} to w_x and derived from (1.6) indicates that the $(k-1)$ solitons for $i = 2, ..., k$ become close to zero.

The paper is organized as follows. We first give in section 2 a modulation technique in similarity variables to control the solution near a decoupled sum of generalized solitons $\pm\kappa^*(\bar{d}_i, \bar{\nu}_i)$. We then prove Theorems 1 and 2 in Section 3 and Corollary 1.1.

2 Modulation of solutions of equation (1.1) near a decoupled sum of generalized solitons

2.1 The modulation result

In this section, we consider a function close to a decoupled sum of generalized solitons κ^* (1.14) and decompose it in a unique way so to respect some orthogonality conditions. In fact, we will extend our former results proved near the sum of decoupled pure solitons $\kappa(d)$ in [17]. In some sense, we now add one parameter to the solitons (the parameter ν) which gives the heteroclinic orbit $\kappa^*(d,\nu)$ between the pure soliton $\kappa(d)$ and 0 or ∞.
We first introduce for $l = 0$ or 1, for any $d \in (-1,1)$ and $r \in \mathcal{H}$,

$$\pi_l^d(r) = \phi\left(W_l(d), r\right) \tag{2.1}$$

where

- $$\phi(q,r) = \int_{-1}^{1} \left(q_1 r_1 + q_1' r_1'(1-y^2) + q_2 r_2\right)\rho dy = \int_{-1}^{1} \left(q_1\left(-\mathcal{L}r_1 + r_1\right) + q_2 r_2\right)\rho dy,$$
- $$W_l(d,y) = \left(W_{l,1}(d,y), W_{l,2}(d,y)\right) \tag{2.2}$$

with

$$W_{1,2}(d,y)(y) = c_1(d)\frac{(1-d^2)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}(1-y^2)}{(1+dy)^{\frac{2}{p-1}+1}},\ \ W_{0,2}(d,y) = c_0\frac{(1-d^2)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}(y+d)}{(1+dy)^{\frac{2}{p-1}+1}}, \tag{2.3}$$

and $W_{l,1}(d,y) \in \mathcal{H}_0$ is uniquely determined as the solution of

$$-\mathcal{L}r + r = \left(l - \frac{p+3}{p-1}\right)W_{l,2}(d) - 2y\partial_y W_{l,2}(d) + \frac{8}{p-1}\frac{W_{l,2}(d)}{1-y^2}. \tag{2.4}$$

See (2.10) below for the definition of $c_1(d)$ and c_0. We now claim the following:

Proposition 2.1 (A modulation technique) *For all $A \geq 1$, there exist $E_0(A) > 0$ and $\epsilon_0(A) > 0$ such that for all $E \geq E_0$ and $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$, if $m \in [1,k]$, $v \in \mathcal{H}$ and for all $i = 1,...,m$, $(\bar{d}_i, \bar{\nu}_i) \in (-1,1)\times\mathbb{R}$ are such that*

$$-1 + \frac{1}{A} \leq \frac{\bar{\nu}_i}{1-|\bar{d}_i|} \leq A,\ \ \bar{\zeta}_{i+1}^* - \bar{\zeta}_i^* \geq E \textit{ and } \|\bar{q}\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq \epsilon \tag{2.5}$$

where $\bar{q} = v - \displaystyle\sum_{j=1}^{m}(-1)^j \kappa^*(\bar{d}_j, \bar{\nu}_j)$ and $\bar{d}_i^* = \frac{\bar{d}_i}{1+\bar{\nu}_i} = -\tanh\bar{\zeta}_i^*$, then, there exist (d_i, ν_i) such that for all $i = 1,...,m$ and $l = 0,1$,

- $$\pi_l^{d_i^*}(q) = 0 \textit{ where } q = v - \sum_{j=1}^{m}(-1)^j \kappa^*(d_j,\nu_j), \tag{2.6}$$
- $$\left|\frac{\nu_i}{1-|d_i|} - \frac{\bar{\nu}_i}{1-|\bar{d}_i|}\right| + |\zeta_i^* - \bar{\zeta}_i^*| \leq C(A)\|\bar{q}\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq C(A)\epsilon, \tag{2.7}$$
- $$-1 + \frac{1}{2A} \leq \frac{\nu_i}{1-|d_i|} \leq A+1,\ \ \zeta_{i+1}^* - \zeta_i^* \geq \frac{E}{2} \textit{ and } \|q\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq C(A)\epsilon \tag{2.8}$$

where $d_i^* = \frac{d_i}{1+\nu_i} = -\tanh\zeta_i^*$.

Remark: When $\bar{\nu}_i = 0$ for all $i = 1, ..., m$, we have already proved and used this result in [17] (see Lemma 3.9 there), with only one orthogonality condition for each i, namely $\pi_0^{d_i}(q) = 0$ (note that in this case, $d_i = d_i^*$). Here, the fact that ν_i is allowed to move enables us to add an additional constraint in the problem, namely $\pi_1^{d_i^*}(q) = 0$.

Our modulation lemma follows from the following technical claim:

Claim 2.2 *If (d_i, ν_i) for $i = 1, ..., m$ satisfy (2.8) for some $A \geq 1$ and $E > 0$ large enough, then we have for some $C^* = C^*(A) > 0$:*
(i) for $i = j$,

$$\begin{array}{rclrcl} \pi_0^{d_i^*}(\partial_\nu \kappa^*(d_i, \nu_i)) & = & 0, & -\frac{C^*}{1-d_i^{*2}} \leq \pi_1^{d_i^*}(\partial_\nu \kappa^*(d_i, \nu_i)) & \leq & -\frac{1}{C^*(1-d_i^{*2})}, \\ |\pi_1^{d_i^*}(\partial_d \kappa^*(d_i, \nu_i))| & \leq & \frac{C^*}{1-d_i^{*2}}, & -\frac{C^*}{1-d_i^{*2}} \leq \pi_0^{d_i^*}(\partial_d \kappa^*(d_i, \nu_i)) & \leq & -\frac{1}{C^*(1-d_i^{*2})} \end{array}$$

where $d_i^* = \frac{d_i}{1+\nu_i}$.
(ii) for $i \neq j$ and $l = 0$ or 1,

$$\left|\pi_l^{d_i^*}(\partial_\nu \kappa^*(d_j, \nu_j))\right| + \left|\pi_l^{d_i^*}(\partial_d \kappa^*(d_j, \nu_j))\right| \leq \frac{C^* J_m}{1 - d_j^{*2}}$$

where

$$J_m = \sum_{n=1}^{m-1} e^{-\frac{1}{p-1}(\zeta_{n+1}^* - \zeta_n^*)}. \qquad (2.9)$$

Let us first use Claim 2.2 to prove Proposition 2.1. Then, we will prove Claim 2.2. Before that, let us recall from page 86 in [15] the values of the constants $c_1(d)$ and c_0 appearing in the definition of $W_{l,2}(d, y)$ (2.3)

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \frac{1}{c_1(d)} & = & (1-d^2)^{\frac{p+1}{p-1}}(I_2(d) + \frac{2(p+1)}{p-1} I_3(d)) \in [\frac{1}{C}, C], \qquad (2.10) \\ \frac{1}{c_0} & = & \frac{4(1-d^2)^{\frac{2}{p-1}}}{p-1} \int_{-1}^{1} \frac{(y+d)^2}{(1+dy)^{\frac{4}{p-1}+2}} \frac{\rho}{1-y^2} dy = \frac{4}{p-1} \int_{-1}^{1} Y^2 (1-Y^2)^{\frac{2}{p-1}-1} dY \end{array}$$

(we performed the change of variables $Y = \frac{y+d}{1+yd}$ in the second line), with

$$I_n(d) = \int_{-1}^{1} \frac{(1-y^2)\rho}{(1+dy)^{\frac{4}{p-1}+n}}. \qquad (2.11)$$

We recall also from Lemma 4.4 page 85 in [15] that for all $d \in (-1, 1)$,

$$\|W_l(d)\|_{\mathcal{H}} + (1-d^2)\|\partial_d W_l(d)\|_{\mathcal{H}} + \|F_l(d)\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq C \text{ and } \phi(F_m(d), W_l(d)) = \delta_{m,l} \qquad (2.12)$$

where

$$F_1(d, y) = (1-d^2)^{\frac{p}{p-1}} \begin{pmatrix} (1+dy)^{-\frac{2}{p-1}-1} \\ (1+dy)^{-\frac{2}{p-1}-1} \end{pmatrix}, \quad F_0(d, y) = (1-d^2)^{\frac{1}{p-1}} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{y+d}{(1+dy)^{\frac{2}{p-1}+1}} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}. \qquad (2.13)$$

Let us also introduce the following change of variables

$$(d,\nu)\mapsto(\zeta,\eta)=(\zeta(d,\nu),\eta(d,\nu))=(-\operatorname{argth} d,\frac{\nu}{1-d^2}) \tag{2.14}$$

and its inverse

$$(\zeta,\eta)\mapsto(d,\nu)=(d(\zeta,\eta),\nu(\zeta,\eta))=(-\tanh\zeta,\eta(1-\tanh^2\zeta)). \tag{2.15}$$

Proof of Proposition 2.1 assuming Claim 2.2: Considering an integer $m\in[1,k]$, we define

$$\begin{array}{rlll}\Psi: & \mathcal{H}\times(\mathbb{R}\times(-1,\infty))^m & \to & \mathbb{R}^{2m}\\ & (v,(\zeta_i,\eta_i)_{i=1,...,m}) & \mapsto & (\pi_1^{d_i^*}(q),\pi_0^{d_i^*}(q))_{i=1,...,m}\end{array} \tag{2.16}$$

with $q=v-\sum_{j=1}^m(-1)^j\kappa^*(d_j,\nu_j)$, $(d_j,\nu_j)=(d(\zeta_j,\eta_j),\nu(\zeta_j,\eta_j))$ defined in (2.15) and $d_j^*=\frac{d_j}{1+\nu_j}$.

Given some positive A, E and ϵ together with $v\in\mathcal{H}$ and $(\bar{d}_i,\bar{\nu}_i)\in((-1,1)\times\mathbb{R})^m$ satisfying (2.5), the conclusion follows from the application of the implicit function theorem to Ψ near the point

$$(\bar{v},(\bar{\zeta}_i,\bar{\eta}_i)_{i=1,...,m})=\left(\sum_{i=1}^m(-1)^i\kappa^*(\bar{d}_i,\bar{\nu}_i),(\zeta(\bar{d}_i,\bar{\nu}_i),\eta(\bar{d}_i,\bar{\nu}_i))_{i=1,...,m}\right).$$

Three facts have to be checked:
1- Note first that

$$\Psi\left(\bar{v},(\bar{\zeta}_i,\bar{\eta}_i)_{i=1,...,m}\right)=0. \tag{2.17}$$

2- Then, we compute from the definitions (2.16), (2.1) and (2.2) of Ψ, π_l^d and ϕ, for $l=0,1$ and $i,j\in\{1,...,m\}$,

$$\begin{aligned}D_v\Psi(v,(\zeta_j,\eta_j)_{j=1,...,m})(u) &= (\pi_1^{d_j^*}(u),\pi_0^{d_j^*}(u))_{j=1,...,m}, \quad (2.18)\\ \frac{\partial}{\partial\zeta_j}\pi_l^{d_i^*}(q) &= (-1)^{j+1}\pi_l^{d_i^*}(\partial_\zeta\kappa^*(d_j,\nu_j))+\delta_{i,j}\frac{\partial d_j^*}{\partial\zeta_j}\phi(\partial_d W_l(d_j^*),q),\\ \frac{\partial}{\partial\eta_j}\pi_l^{d_i^*}(q) &= (-1)^{j+1}\pi_l^{d_i^*}(\partial_\eta\kappa^*(d_j,\nu_j))+\delta_{i,j}\frac{\partial d_j^*}{\partial\eta_j}\phi(\partial_d W_l(d_j^*),q),\end{aligned}$$

where we differentiate the function $\kappa^*(d,\nu)$ with respect to (ζ,η) defined by the change of variables (2.14).

Assume now that $(v,(\zeta_i,\eta_i)_{i=1,...,m})$ satisfies condition (2.8) where q is defined in (2.6). Note from the definition (3.23) of $\lambda(d,\nu)$ and (2.8) that we have

$$\forall i=1,...,m,\ \ (3A)^{-\frac{2}{p-1}}\le\lambda(d_i,\nu_i)\le(2A)^{\frac{2}{p-1}}\ \text{ and }\ -1+\frac{1}{2A}\le\nu_i\le 2A. \tag{2.19}$$

Using the definitions (2.1) and (2.2) of π_l^d and ϕ, together with (2.12), we see from (2.18) that

$$\|D_v\Psi(v,(\zeta_i,\eta_i)_{i=1,...,m})\|\le C.$$

3- Let M be the Jacobian matrix of Ψ with respect to $(\zeta_i, \eta_i)_{i=1,\dots,m}$. Since we have from the change of variables (2.15)

$$\operatorname*{Jac}_{(\zeta,\eta)}(d,\nu) = (1-d^2)\begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ \dfrac{2\nu d}{1-d^2} & 1 \end{pmatrix} \tag{2.20}$$

and from (2.19)

$$\left|\frac{\partial d_i^*}{\partial d_i}\right| + \left|\frac{\partial d_i^*}{\partial \nu_i}\right| \le \frac{2}{1+\nu_i} \le 4A,$$

we see from (ii) of Claim 2.2 together with (2.12) that (2.18) yields

$$M = M_0 + M_R \text{ where } |M_R| \le CJ_m + C\|q\|_{\mathcal{H}}, \tag{2.21}$$

and $M_0 = \operatorname{diag}(P(d_1,\nu_1), \dots, (-1)^{m+1}P(d_m,\nu_m))$ is a $(2m)\times(2m)$ matrix, with

$$P(d,\nu) = \begin{pmatrix} \pi_1^{d^*}(\partial_\zeta \kappa^*) & \pi_1^{d^*}(\partial_\eta \kappa^*) \\ \pi_0^{d^*}(\partial_\zeta \kappa^*) & \pi_0^{d^*}(\partial_\eta \kappa^*) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \pi_1^{d^*}(\partial_d \kappa^*) & \pi_1^{d^*}(\partial_\nu \kappa^*) \\ \pi_0^{d^*}(\partial_d \kappa^*) & \pi_0^{d^*}(\partial_\nu \kappa^*) \end{pmatrix} \operatorname*{Jac}_{(\zeta,\eta)}(d,\nu)$$

and $d^* = \frac{d}{1+\nu}$. Since we easily check from (2.8), (2.19) and (2.20) that

$$\frac{1}{12A^2} \le \frac{1-d_i^{*2}}{1-d_i^2} \le 8A^2 \tag{2.22}$$

and

$$\text{the matrix } \operatorname*{Jac}_{(\zeta,\eta)}(d,\nu) \text{ is invertible with } \|\operatorname*{Jac}_{(\zeta,\eta)}(d,\nu)^{-1}\| \le \frac{C(A)}{1-d^2} \tag{2.23}$$

whenever $\frac{|\nu|}{1-|d|} \le A+1$, using (i) of Claim 2.2, we see that $\pi_0^{d_i^*}(\partial_\nu \kappa^*(d_i,\nu_i)) = 0$ and the matrix $P(d_i,\nu_i)$ is invertible with $\|P(d_i,\nu_i)^{-1}\| \le C(A)$. Therefore, the matrix M_0 is invertible too and $\|M_0^{-1}\| \le C(A)$. From (2.21), the definition (2.9) of J_m and condition (2.8), we see that for E large enough and ϵ small enough,

$$\text{the matrix } M \text{ is also invertible with } \|M^{-1}\| \le C(A).$$

Conclusion: From 1-, 2- and 3-, we see that the implicit function theorem applies and given $v \in \mathcal{H}$, $(\bar d_i, \bar\nu_i)$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$ satisfying (2.5), we get the existence of other parameters (d_i, ν_i) such that for all $i = 1, \dots, m$ and $l = 0$ or 1,

$$|\zeta_i - \bar\zeta_i| + |\eta_i - \bar\eta_i| \le \|\bar q\|_{\mathcal{H}} \le C(A)\epsilon$$

and (2.6) holds, where $\bar q$ is defined after (2.5) and the parameters are defined by the change of variables (2.14).
Since

$$(\zeta,\eta) \mapsto \kappa^*(d,\nu) \text{ and } (\zeta,\eta) \mapsto \left(-\operatorname{argth}\left(\frac{d}{1+\nu}\right), \frac{\nu}{1-|d|}\right)$$

are Lipschitz (see (ii) of Lemma A.2 for the first and use composition for the second), we see that (2.7) holds, hence (2.8) holds too. This gives the conclusion of Proposition 2.1, assuming Claim 2.2. It remains to prove Claim 2.2 in order to finish the proof of Proposition 2.1.

2.2 Proof of Claim 2.2

This section is dedicated to the proof of Claim 2.2.

Proof of Claim 2.2: Since (d_i, ν_i) for $i = 1, ..., m$ satisfy (2.8), note that (2.19) holds here. In particular, $\nu_i > -1$ and $d_i^* = \frac{d_i}{1+\nu_i}$ as well as $\zeta_i^* = -\operatorname{argth} d_i^*$ are well defined. For simplicity, we drop down the subscript i in d_i, ν_i and d_i^*. Using the definition (1.14) of κ^*, we write

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_\nu \kappa^*(d,\nu,y) &= \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{2\kappa_0}{p-1}\frac{(1-d^2)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}}{(1+\nu+dy)^{\frac{2}{p-1}+1}} \\ -\frac{2\kappa_0}{p-1}\frac{(1-d^2)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}}{(1+\nu+dy)^{\frac{2}{p-1}+1}} + \frac{2(p+1)}{(p-1)^2}\kappa_0\nu\frac{(1-d^2)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}}{(1+\nu+dy)^{\frac{2}{p-1}+2}} \end{pmatrix}, \\
\partial_d \kappa^*(d,\nu,y) &= \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{2d\kappa_0}{p-1}\frac{(1-d^2)^{\frac{1}{p-1}-1}}{(1+\nu+dy)^{\frac{2}{p-1}}} - \frac{2y\kappa_0}{p-1}\frac{(1-d^2)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}}{(1+\nu+dy)^{\frac{2}{p-1}+1}} \\ \frac{4d\kappa_0\nu}{(p-1)^2}\frac{(1-d^2)^{\frac{1}{p-1}-1}}{(1+\nu+dy)^{\frac{2}{p-1}+1}} + \frac{2(p+1)\kappa_0}{(p-1)^2}y\nu\frac{(1-d^2)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}}{(1+\nu+dy)^{\frac{2}{p-1}+2}} \end{pmatrix}.
\end{aligned}$$

Using the definitions (3.23) and (2.13) of λ and $F_l(d^*)$ together with (2.19), we see after straightforward calculations that

$$\frac{1}{L_1}\partial_\nu \kappa^*(d,\nu,y) = -F_1(d^*,y) + \frac{p+1}{(p-1)}\frac{\nu}{(1+\nu)}\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \frac{(1-{d^*}^2)^{\frac{p}{p-1}}}{(1+d^*y)^{\frac{2}{p-1}+2}} \end{pmatrix} \tag{2.24}$$

$$\frac{1}{L_0}\partial_d \kappa^*(d,\nu,y) = -F_0(d^*,y) - \frac{d^*\nu(\nu+2)}{1-{d^*}^2}F_1(d^*,y) + \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ G \end{pmatrix} \tag{2.25}$$

where (from the definition (3.23) of λ and (2.19))

$$L_1 = \frac{2\kappa_0(1-d^2)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}(1+\nu)^{-\frac{p+1}{p-1}}}{(p-1)(1-{d^*}^2)^{\frac{p}{p-1}}} = \frac{2\kappa_0\lambda(1+\nu)^{-1}}{(p-1)(1-{d^*}^2)} \in I^*, \tag{2.26}$$

$$L_0 = \frac{2\kappa_0(1-d^2)^{\frac{1}{p-1}-1}(1+\nu)^{-\frac{p+1}{p-1}}}{(p-1)(1-{d^*}^2)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}} = \frac{2\kappa_0\lambda^{2-p}(1+\nu)^{-3}}{(p-1)(1-{d^*}^2)} \in I^*, \tag{2.27}$$

$$G = d\nu\frac{F_{1,2}(d^*,y)}{1-{d^*}^2}\left(\frac{\nu+2}{\nu+1} + \frac{2}{p-1}\right) + \left(\frac{p+1}{p-1}\right)\frac{\nu}{\nu+1}y(1-d^2)\frac{(1-{d^*}^2)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}}{(1+d^*y)^{\frac{2}{p-1}+2}} \tag{2.28}$$

and $I^* = [\frac{1}{C^*(1-{d^*}^2)}, \frac{C^*}{(1-{d^*}^2)}])$.

(i) We first project $\partial_\nu\kappa^*$ then $\partial_d\kappa^*$.

- Projecting identity (2.24) with $\pi_l^{d^*}$ defined in (2.1) and $l = 1$ or 0, we write from the duality relation in (2.12)

$$\pi_l^{d^*}(\partial_\nu\kappa^*(d,\nu)) = L_1\left(-\delta_{l,1} + \frac{p+1}{(p-1)}\frac{\nu}{(1+\nu)}(1-{d^*}^2)^{\frac{p}{p-1}}\int_{-1}^{1}\frac{W_{l,2}(d^*,y)\rho}{(1+d^*y)^{\frac{2}{p-1}+2}}dy\right). \tag{2.29}$$

When $l=0$, we write from the definition (2.3) of $W_{0,2}(d^*)$,

$$\begin{aligned}(1-{d^*}^2)^{\frac{p}{p-1}}\int_{-1}^{1}\frac{W_{l,2}(d^*,y)\rho}{(1+d^*y)^{\frac{2}{p-1}+2}}dy &= c_0(1-{d^*}^2)^{\frac{p+1}{p-1}}\int_{-1}^{1}\frac{(y+d^*)(1-y^2)^{\frac{2}{p-1}}}{(1+d^*y)^{\frac{4}{p-1}+3}}dy\\ &= c_0\int_{-1}^{1}Y(1-Y^2)^{\frac{2}{p-1}}dY=0\end{aligned}$$

where $Y=\frac{y+d^*}{1+yd^*}$, hence the first estimate of (i) follows from (2.29).
When $l=1$, we write from (2.29) and the definitions (2.3), (2.10) and (2.11) of $W_{1,2}(d^*)$, $c_1(d^*)$ and $I_3(d^*)$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\pi_1^{d^*}(\partial_\nu\kappa^*(d,\nu))\\ =\ &-c_1(d^*)(1-{d^*}^2)^{\frac{p+1}{p-1}}L_1\left(\frac{(1-{d^*}^2)^{-\frac{p+1}{p-1}}}{c_1(d^*)}-\frac{(p+1)\nu}{(p-1)(1+\nu)}I_3(d^*)\right)\\ =\ &-c_1(d^*)(1-{d^*}^2)^{\frac{p+1}{p-1}}L_1\left(I_2(d^*)+\frac{p+1}{p-1}(2-\frac{\nu}{1+\nu})I_3(d^*)\right)\end{aligned}$$

Since $1\le 2-\frac{\nu}{1+\nu}\le 1+2A$ from (2.19) and

$$\frac{1}{C}\le I_n(d^*)(1-{d^*}^2)^{\frac{2}{p-1}+n-2}\le C \tag{2.30}$$

from (2.11), using (2.26), we see that the second estimate of (i) follows.

- Projecting identity (2.25) with $\pi_l^{d^*}$ defined in (2.1) where $l=0$ or 1, we write from the duality identity (2.12),

$$\pi_l^{d^*}(\partial_d\kappa^*(d,\nu))=L_0(-\delta_{l,0}-\frac{d^*\nu(\nu+2)}{1-{d^*}^2}\delta_{l,1}+\int_{-1}^{1}W_{l,2}(d^*)G\rho dy). \tag{2.31}$$

When $l=1$, since

$$\frac{1-d^2}{1+d^*y}\le 2\frac{(1-d^2)}{1-{d^*}^2}=2\lambda^{p-1}(1+\nu)^2\le C^*$$

from the definition (3.23) of $\lambda(d,\nu)$ and (2.19), we write from the definitions (2.28) and (2.13) of G and $F_1(d^*)$ together with (2.19),

$$|G|\le C^*|\nu|\frac{(1-{d^*}^2)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}}{(1+d^*y)^{\frac{2}{p-1}+1}}. \tag{2.32}$$

Using the definition (2.3) of $W_{1,2}(d^*,y)$, we then write from (2.32) and the definition (2.10) of $I_2(d^*)$,

$$\left|\int_{-1}^{1}W_{1,2}(d^*,y)G\rho dy\right|\le C^*c_1(d^*)(1-{d^*}^2)^{\frac{2}{p-1}}I_2(d^*)\le C^* \tag{2.33}$$

where we use in the last bound (2.10) and (2.30). Since $\left|\frac{d^*\nu(\nu+2)}{1-{d^*}^2}\right|\le C^*$ by (2.8) and (2.19), gathering (2.33), (2.31) and (2.27) gives the third estimate in (i) of Claim 2.2.

When $l=0$, using the change of variables $Y=\frac{y+d^*}{1+yd^*}$, we write from the definition (2.3) and (2.13) of $W_{0,2}(d^*)$ and $F_1(d^*)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{-1}^{1} W_{0,2}(d^*)F_{1,2}(d^*)\rho dy &= c_0(1-{d^*}^2)\int_{-1}^{1}\frac{Y(1-Y^2)^{\frac{2}{p-1}}}{1-Yd^*}dY,\\
\int_{-1}^{1} W_{0,2}(d^*)y\frac{(1-{d^*}^2)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}}{(1+d^*y)^{\frac{2}{p-1}+2}}\rho dy &= \frac{c_0}{1-{d^*}^2}\int_{-1}^{1}Y\frac{(Y-d^*)}{1-Yd^*}(1-Y^2)^{\frac{2}{p-1}}dY. \qquad (2.34)
\end{aligned}$$

Using the fact that $\displaystyle\int_{-1}^{1}Y(1-Y^2)^{\frac{2}{p-1}}dY=0$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{-1}^{1}\frac{Y(1-Y^2)^{\frac{2}{p-1}}}{1-Yd^*}dY &= d^*\int_{-1}^{1}\frac{Y^2(1-Y^2)^{\frac{2}{p-1}}}{1-Yd^*}dY,\\
\frac{1}{1-{d^*}^2}\int_{-1}^{1}Y\frac{(Y-d^*)}{1-Yd^*}(1-Y^2)^{\frac{2}{p-1}}dY &= \int_{-1}^{1}\frac{Y^2(1-Y^2)^{\frac{2}{p-1}}}{1-Yd^*}dY. \qquad (2.35)
\end{aligned}$$

Since we have from the change of variables $y=-Y$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{-1}^{1}\frac{Y^2(1-Y^2)^{\frac{2}{p-1}}}{1-Yd^*}dY &= \frac{1}{2}\left(\int_{-1}^{1}\frac{Y^2(1-Y^2)^{\frac{2}{p-1}}}{1-Yd^*}dY+\int_{-1}^{1}\frac{y^2(1-y^2)^{\frac{2}{p-1}}}{1+yd^*}dy\right)\\
&= \int_{-1}^{1}\frac{Y^2(1-Y^2)^{\frac{2}{p-1}}}{1-Y^2{d^*}^2}dY,
\end{aligned}$$

it follows from (2.28), (2.35) and (2.34) that

$$\int_{-1}^{1}W_{0,2}(d^*)G\rho dy = c_0\frac{\nu}{1+\nu}\left\{\frac{d^2}{1+\nu}+\frac{p+1}{p-1}\right\}\int_{-1}^{1}\frac{Y^2(1-Y^2)^{\frac{2}{p-1}}}{1-Y^2{d^*}^2}dY.$$

Using (2.31) and the definition (2.10) of c_0, we write

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{c_0L_0}\pi_0^{d^*}(\partial_d\kappa^*(d,\nu)) \qquad (2.36)\\
=\ & -\frac{4}{p-1}\int_{-1}^{1}Y^2(1-Y^2)^{\frac{2}{p-1}-1}dY+(1-x)\left(xd^2+\frac{p+1}{p-1}\right)\int_{-1}^{1}\frac{Y^2(1-Y^2)^{\frac{2}{p-1}}}{1-x^2d^2Y^2}dY
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$x=\frac{1}{\nu+1}\in\left(\frac{1}{3A},\frac{1}{1-(1-\frac{1}{2A})(1-|d|)}\right)\subset\left(0,\frac{1}{|d|}\right)$$

from (2.19) and (2.8). Since we have

$$\int_{-1}^{1}\frac{Y^2(1-Y^2)^{\frac{2}{p-1}}}{1-x^2d^2Y^2}dY\le\frac{4}{(3p+1)(1-x^2d^2)}\int_{-1}^{1}Y^2(1-Y^2)^{\frac{2}{p-1}-1}dY \qquad (2.37)$$

(see below for the proof), it follows from (2.36) that

$$-\frac{4}{p-1}I\le\frac{1}{c_0L_0}\pi_0^{d^*}(\partial_d\kappa^*(d,\nu))\le-\frac{4}{p-1}Ig_d(x)\text{ where }I=\int_{-1}^{1}Y^2(1-Y^2)^{\frac{2}{p-1}-1}dY \qquad (2.38)$$

and

$$g_d(x) = 1 - \frac{(1-x)(xd^2(p-1)+p+1)}{(3p+1)(1-x^2d^2)} \text{ with } x \in \left(0, \frac{1}{|d|}\right).$$

Differentiating g_d, we easily write

$$\begin{aligned} & (3p+1)(1-x^2d^2)^2 g_d'(x) = (p+1-d^2(p-1))(d^2x^2+1) - 4d^2x \\ = \quad & (p+1-d^2(p-1))(d^2x^2-2d^2x+1) + 2d^2x(p-1)(1-d^2) > 0, \end{aligned}$$

hence

$$g_d(x) \geq g_d(0) = 1 - \frac{p+1}{(3p+1)} = \frac{2p}{(3p+1)} > 0,$$

and the forth estimate in (i) follows from (2.38) and the bound (2.27) on L_0. It remains then to prove (2.37) to finish the proof of (i) Claim 2.2.

Proof of (2.37):
Putting $t = Y^2$, we write for $\alpha > -1$

$$\int_{-1}^{1} Y^2(1-Y^2)^\alpha dY = \int_0^1 t^{1/2}(1-t)^\alpha dt = B\left(\frac{3}{2}, \alpha+1\right), \tag{2.39}$$

where $B(x,y)$ is the standard Beta function. Since we know that for $\alpha = \frac{2}{p-1}$,

$$\frac{B\left(\frac{3}{2}, \alpha+1\right)}{B\left(\frac{3}{2}, \alpha\right)} = \frac{\alpha}{\alpha+\frac{3}{2}} = \frac{4}{3p+1} \text{ and } 1 - x^2d^2Y^2 \geq 1 - x^2d^2$$

for all $Y \in (-1,1)$, estimate (2.37) follows from (2.39). This concludes the proof of (i) in Claim 2.2.

(ii) Take $i \neq j$ and $l = 0$ or 1. Using the expressions (2.3), (2.4), (2.10) and (1.13) of $W_{l,2}$, $W_{l,1}$, $c_l(d)$ and $\kappa(d,y)$, we write

$$|W_{l,2}(d_i^*, y)| + |\mathcal{L}W_{l,1}(d_i^*, y) - W_{l,1}(d_i^*, y)| \leq C\frac{\kappa(d_i^*, y)}{1-y^2}. \tag{2.40}$$

Since $|F_{1,l}(d_j^*, y)| \leq C\kappa(d_j^*, y)$ by definitions (2.13) and (1.13), using (2.24)-(2.28) together with (2.32), (2.19) and (2.8), we write

$$|\partial_\nu \kappa^*(d_j, \nu_j, y)| + |\partial_d \kappa^*(d_j, \nu_j, y)| \leq \frac{C}{1-d_j^{*2}}(F_{1,1}(d_j^*, y) + F_{0,1}(d_j^*, y)) \leq C\frac{\kappa(d_j^*, y)}{1-d_j^{*2}}. \tag{2.41}$$

Using the expressions (2.1) and (2.2) of $\pi_l^{d_i^*}$ and ϕ together with (2.40) and (2.41), we write

$$\begin{aligned} & \left|\pi_l^{d_i^*}(\partial_\nu \kappa^*(d_j, \nu_j))\right| + \left|\pi_l^{d_i^*}(\partial_d \kappa^*(d_j, \nu_j))\right| \leq \frac{C}{1-d_j^{*2}} \int_{-1}^{1} \kappa(d_i^*, y)\kappa(d_j^*, y)\frac{\rho}{1-y^2}dy \\ \leq \quad & \frac{C}{1-d_j^{*2}}|\zeta_j^* - \zeta_i^*|e^{-\frac{2}{p-1}|\zeta_j^*-\zeta_i^*|} \leq \frac{C}{1-d_j^{*2}}J_m \end{aligned}$$

with J_m defined in (2.9) and where we used Lemma C.3 for the last inequality. This concludes the proof of Claim 2.2 and Proposition 2.1 too. ■

3 Characteristic points are isolated (Proofs of Theorems 1 and 2)

This section is dedicated to the proof of Theorems 1 and 2 and Corollary 1.1. Consider $u(x,t)$ a blow-up solution of equation (1.1). Note that we already know from Proposition 5 in [17] (stated in page 2 here) that the interior of $\mathcal{S}$ is empty. We will prove in this section that all the points of $\mathcal{S}$ are isolated.

Consider $x_0 \in \mathcal{S}$. From translation invariance of equation (1.1), we can assume that $x_0 = T(x_0) = 0$, hence,

$$0 \in \mathcal{S} \text{ and } T(0) = 0. \tag{3.1}$$

In the following, we use the notation $W(Y,S)$ instead of $w_0(y,s)$ defined in the selfsimilar transformation in (1.6). Up to replacing $u(x,t)$ by $-u(x,t)$, we see from Proposition 1.3 that for some integer $k = k(0) \geq 2$, for some continuous functions $D_i(S)$, $C_0 > 0$ and $S_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$\left\| \begin{pmatrix} W(S) \\ \partial_s W(S) \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} \sum\limits_{i=1}^{k} (-1)^i \kappa(D_i(S)) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\|_{\mathcal{H}} \to 0 \text{ as } S \to \infty, \tag{3.2}$$

$$\forall S \geq S_0, \qquad \left| \operatorname{argth} D_i(S) - \frac{\gamma_i}{2} \log S \right| \leq C_0 \text{ where } \gamma_i = (p-1)\left(\frac{k+1}{2} - i\right). \tag{3.3}$$

Introducing for $x \neq 0$, $b = b(x)$ by

$$-\frac{T(x)}{|x|} = 1 - b(x) \text{ and } l = l(x) = |\log|x||, \tag{3.4}$$

we see from (1.4) that

$$0 < b \leq \frac{C_0}{l^{\gamma_1}}. \tag{3.5}$$

We proceed in three steps:

- In Section 3.1, we consider $x < 0$ close to $0 \in \mathcal{S}$ and $m \leq k$, and use a modulation technique to study w_x near the sum $\sum_{i=1}^m (-1)^i \kappa^*(d_i, \nu_i)$..

- In Section 3.2, we state and prove a proposition which directly implies Theorems 1 and 2.

- In Section 3.3, we prove Corollary 1.1.

3.1 Dynamical behavior of w_x for small x

Consider some positive $L_{\hat{k}}$,....,L_{k+1} where $\hat{k} = E\left(\frac{k+1}{2}\right)$. Then, for each $x < 0$ with $|x|$ small, we introduce $s_m(x)$ as follows:

$$s_{k+1} = s_{k+1}(x) = L_{k+1}, \tag{3.6}$$

$$s_m = s_m(x) = l + \gamma_m \log l + L_m \text{ if } \hat{k}+1 \leq m \leq k, \tag{3.7}$$

where S_0 and γ_m are defined in (3.3).
Then, from (3.3) and the continuity of D_1, we define $s_{\hat{k}} = s_{\hat{k}}(x)$ maximal such that

$$s_{\hat{k}} \in [L_{k+1}, l + L_{\hat{k}}] \text{ and } \forall s \in [L_{k+1}, s_{\hat{k}}], \quad \frac{\bar{\nu}_1(x,s)}{1 - \bar{d}_1(x,s)} \geq -1 + e^{-(p-1)L_{\hat{k}}}, \tag{3.8}$$

where

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \bar{\nu}_i(s) & = & \bar{\nu}_i(x,s) = [b - (1 - \bar{d}_i(x,s))]xe^s, \quad \bar{d}_i(s) = \bar{d}_i(x,s) = D_i(S(x,s)) \\ \text{and} & & T(0) - e^{-S(x,s)} = T(x) - e^{-s}. \end{array} \tag{3.9}$$

Note from (3.1) and (3.4) that we have

$$-e^{-S(x,s)} = x(1-b) - e^{-s} \text{ and } S(s) = S(x,s) = -\log[|x|(1-b) + e^{-s}]. \tag{3.10}$$

Following this, we also introduce for all $m \in [\hat{k}, k+1]$,

$$S_m = S_m(x) = S(x, s_m(x)) = -\log[|x|(1-b) + e^{-s_m(x)}]. \tag{3.11}$$

From (3.8), one of the following cases occurs:

$$\textbf{(Case 1)} \quad s_{\hat{k}} = l + L_{\hat{k}}, \tag{3.12}$$

$$\textbf{(Case 2)} \quad s_{\hat{k}} < l + L_{\hat{k}} \text{ and } \frac{\bar{\nu}_1(x,s)}{1 - \bar{d}_1(x,s)} = -1 + e^{-(p-1)L_{\hat{k}}}. \tag{3.13}$$

Note that a step of the proof is devoted to the proof that Case 2 does not occur and that $s_{\hat{k}} = l + L_{\hat{k}}$, provided that the constants L_m for $\hat{k} \leq m \leq k+1$ are fixed large enough and $|x|$ small enough. Note also that for $|x|$ small enough, we have

$$s_{k+1} \leq s_k \leq ... \leq s_{\hat{k}+1} \leq s_{\hat{k}} \leq l + L_{\hat{k}}. \tag{3.14}$$

Indeed, all these inequalities are obvious by definition except the inequality $s_{\hat{k}+1} \leq s_{\hat{k}}$ which follows from the fact that $\frac{|\bar{\nu}_1(s_{\hat{k}+1})|}{1 - |\bar{d}_1(s_{\hat{k}+1})|} \leq Ce^{L_{\hat{k}+1}} l^{\gamma_{\hat{k}+1}} \to 0$ as $x \to 0$ (to prove this, see the definition (3.9) of $\bar{\nu}_1$ and $\bar{d}_1$, (3.3), the bound (3.5) on b and the definition (3.7) of $s_{\hat{k}+1}$).

We now give the following decomposition result for $(w_x(s), \partial_s w_x(s))$:

Proposition 3.1 (Decomposition of $(w_x(s), \partial_s w_x(s))$ for $s \in [s_{k+1}, s_{\hat{k}}]$) *For all $m \in [\hat{k}, k]$, if $L_m > 0$ is large enough, then it holds that*

$$\lim_{L_{m+1} \to \infty} \left(\lim_{x \to 0^-} \sup_{s_{m+1} \leq s \leq s_m} \left\| \begin{pmatrix} w_x(s) \\ \partial_s w_x(s) \end{pmatrix} - \sum_{i=1}^{m} (-1)^i \kappa^* \left(\bar{d}_i(s), \bar{\nu}_i(s) \right) \right\|_{\mathcal{H}} \right) = 0. \tag{3.15}$$

Remark: What we actually prove is that if L_m is large enough, $0 < \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0(L_m)$, $L_{m+1} \geq L_{m+1,0}(L_m, \epsilon)$ and $-a_0(L_m, \epsilon, L_{m+1}) \leq x < 0$ for some positive ϵ_0, $L_{m+1,0}$ and a_0, then

$$\sup_{s_{m+1} \leq s \leq s_m} \left\| \begin{pmatrix} w_x(s) \\ \partial_s w_x(s) \end{pmatrix} - \sum_{i=1}^{m} (-1)^i \kappa^* \left(\bar{d}_i(s), \bar{\nu}_i(s) \right) \right\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq \epsilon.$$

Remark: For all $i \in [1,k]$ and $s \in [s_{k+1}, s_{\hat{k}}]$, we have

$$1+\bar{\nu}_i(s) - |\bar{d}_i(s)| > 0 \tag{3.16}$$

which means by definition (1.14) of κ^* that $\kappa^*\left(\bar{d}_i(s), \bar{\nu}_i(s)\right)$ is well defined for all $y \in (-1,1)$. Indeed, if $\bar{d}_i(s) \geq 0$, then we write from the definition (3.9) of $\bar{\nu}_i(s)$, the expansion (3.3) of D_i and the definition (3.8) of $s_{\hat{k}}$ that $1+\bar{\nu}_i(s) - |\bar{d}_i(s)| \geq 1+\bar{\nu}_1(s) - \bar{d}_1(s) > 0$ and (3.16) follows. If $\bar{d}_i(s) < 0$, then we see from (3.9) and the bound (3.5) on b that $\bar{\nu}_i(s) \geq 0$ and (3.16) follows.

Proof of Proposition 3.1: In order to prove Proposition 3.1, we proceed in two steps:
- In Step 1, we use the selfsimilar transformation (1.6) to change the estimate (3.2) on $W(Y,S)$ into an estimate on $w_x(y,s)$ where $x<0$ is close to 0 and $s \in [s_{k+1}, s_{\hat{k}}]$, valid only for $y \in (y_1(s), 1)$ where

$$y_1(s) = -1 - 2bxe^s > -1. \tag{3.17}$$

- In Step 2, we use the modulation technique of Section 2 to extend this estimate to the whole interval $(-1,1)$ and prove Proposition 3.1.

Step 1: Decomposition of $(w_x(s), \partial_s w_x(s))$ for $s \in [s_{k+1}, s_{\hat{k}}]$ and $y \in (y_1(s), 1)$
Here, we transform the estimate (3.2) through the change of variables (1.6) to get the following:

Lemma 3.2 (Decomposition of $(w_x(s), \partial_s w_x(s))$ on $(y_1(s), 1)$) *For all $m \in [\hat{k}, k]$ and $L_m > 0$, it holds that*

$$\lim_{L_{m+1}\to\infty}\left(\lim_{x\to 0^-}\sup_{s_{m+1}\leq s\leq s_m}\left\|\begin{pmatrix} w_x(s) \\ \partial_s w_x(s)\end{pmatrix} - \sum_{i=1}^{k}(-1)^i\kappa^*\left(\bar{d}_i(s), \bar{\nu}_i(s)\right)\right\|_{\mathcal{H}(y>y_1(s))}\right) = 0,$$

where $y_1(s)$ is defined in (3.17).

Remark: Note that all the solitons $\kappa^*(\bar{d}_i(s), \bar{\nu}_i(s))$ appearing in this statement are well defined thanks to the remark following Proposition 3.1. Note also that we count all the solitons in the estimate of Lemma 3.2, unlike Proposition 3.1 where we count only the solitons from $i=1$ to $i=m$. As a matter of fact, thanks to the vanishing property of Lemma 3.4, we will use in the proof of Claim 3.7 in Appendix B the fact that Lemma 3.2 holds in fact with a sum running from $i=1$ to $i=m$ too.
Proof: Introducing the transformation

$$\mathcal{T}(v)(y,s) = (1-(1-b)xe^s)^{-\frac{2}{p-1}} v(Y,S),\ \ Y = \frac{y+xe^s}{1-(1-b)xe^s}\ \ S = s - \log(1-(1-b)xe^s), \tag{3.18}$$

we see from the selfsimilar transformation (1.6) and the definition (3.4) of b that

$$\mathcal{T}(W) = w_x. \tag{3.19}$$

Using the definitions (1.13) and (1.14) of $\kappa(d,y)$ and $\kappa_1^*(d,\nu,y)$, we see that for all $d \in (-1,1)$ and $s \in \mathbb{R}$, if $1+[b-(1-d)]xe^s > |d|$, then

$$\forall y \in (-1,1),\ \ \mathcal{T}(\kappa(d,\cdot))(y,s) = \kappa_1^*\left(d, [b-(1-d)]xe^s, y\right). \tag{3.20}$$

Therefore, defining the error terms R and r by

$$R(Y,S) = \left(\begin{array}{l} R_1(Y,S) \\ R_2(Y,S) \end{array}\right) = \left(\begin{array}{l} W(Y,S) \\ \partial_s W(Y,S) \end{array}\right) - \sum_{i=1}^{k}(-1)^i \left(\begin{array}{l} \kappa(D_i(S),Y) \\ 0 \end{array}\right), \quad (3.21)$$

$$r(y,s) = \left(\begin{array}{l} r_1(y,s) \\ r_2(y,s) \end{array}\right)$$

$$= \left(\begin{array}{l} w_x(y,s) \\ \partial_s w_x(y,s) \end{array}\right) - \sum_{i=1}^{k}(-1)^i \kappa^*\left(\bar{d}_i(s),\bar{\nu}_i(s),y\right), \quad (3.22)$$

we get the following estimate from (3.18):

Claim 3.3 (Transformation of the error terms on $(y_1(s),1)$) *For all $m \in [\hat{k},k]$, $L_m > 0$ and $|x|$ small enough with $x < 0$, we have for all $s \in [s_{m+1}, s_m]$,*

$$\left\| \left(\begin{array}{l} r_1 \\ r_2 \end{array}\right)(s) \right\|_{\mathcal{H}(y>y_1(s))} \le C(L_m) \left\| \left(\begin{array}{l} R_1 \\ R_2 \end{array}\right)(S) \right\|_{\mathcal{H}}$$

where $S = S(s)$ is defined in (3.10).

Proof: see Appendix B. ■

Since $\|(R_1,R_2)(S)\|_{\mathcal{H}} \to 0$ as $S \to \infty$ from (3.2) and (3.21) and

$$\forall s \in [s_{m+1}, s_m], \quad S(s) \ge S_{m+1} \ge L_{m+1} - 1$$

for $|x|$ small enough from (3.11) and (3.6), this concludes the proof of Lemma 3.2. ■

Step 2: Decomposition of $(w_x(s), \partial_s w_x(s))$ on $(-1,1)$ for $s \in [s_{k+1}, s_{\hat{k}}]$

In this step, we consider the equation (1.7) satisfied by w and we linearize it around $\sum_{i=1}^{m}(-1)^i\kappa^*(\bar{d}_i(s),\bar{\nu}_i(s))$ (which is an approximate solution of (1.7) in the considered regime) in order to extend the estimate of Lemma 3.2 to the whole interval $(-1,1)$ and prove Proposition 3.1.

We first consider in the following claim the soliton $\kappa^*(\bar{d}_i(s),\bar{\nu}_i(s))$ where $i \in [2,k]$ appearing in the decomposition we aim at proving in Proposition 3.1, and show that it "vanishes" at time $s = s_i$ defined in (3.7) when $i \ge \hat{k}+1$, and at time $s = l + L_{\hat{k}}$ when $i \in [2,\hat{k}]$. By "vanishing", we mean that the norm of the i-th soliton becomes smaller than $Ce^{-\frac{L}{p-1}}$ (where $L = L_i$ if $i \ge \hat{k}+1$ and $L = L_{\hat{k}}$ if $i \le \hat{k}$), which may be made as small as we wish by taking L large enough. More precisely, we have the following:

Claim 3.4 (Vanishing of $\kappa^*(\bar{d}_i(s),\nu_i(s))$ for large s) *The following holds for $x < 0$ and $|x|$ small enough:*

- if $i \in [\hat{k}+1,k]$ and $s \in [s_i, l+L_{\hat{k}}]$, then $\|\kappa^*(\bar{d}_i(s),\bar{\nu}_i(s))\|_{\mathcal{H}} \le C\lambda(\bar{d}_i(s),\bar{\nu}_i(s)) \le Ce^{-\frac{L_i}{p-1}}$;

- if $i \in [2,\hat{k}]$, then $\|\kappa^*(\bar{d}_i(l+L_{\hat{k}}),\bar{\nu}_i(l+L_{\hat{k}}))\|_{\mathcal{H}} \le C\lambda(\bar{d}_i(l+L_{\hat{k}}),\bar{\nu}_i(l+L_{\hat{k}})) \le Ce^{-\frac{L_{\hat{k}}}{p-1}}$, where

$$\lambda = \lambda(d,\nu) = \frac{(1-d^2)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}}{[(1+\nu)^2 - d^2]^{\frac{1}{p-1}}}. \quad (3.23)$$

Proof: See Appendix B. ■

Remark: As we announced in the strategy of the proof given in section 1.3, when $s = s_{k+1}$ defined in (3.6), $w_x(s)$ is close to a sum of k decoupled solitons. As time increases, we start loosing the solitons beginning with the k-th at time s_k, up to the $(\hat{k}+1)$-th at time $s_{\hat{k}+1}$, and finishing with all the solitons for $i = 2$ to $\hat{k}$, which vanish at the same time $s = l + L_{\hat{k}}$, leaving only the first soliton in the decomposition of $w_x(s)$. As a matter of fact, the values of s_m for $m \in [\hat{k}, k]$ we took in (3.7) and (3.8) were chosen on purpose to guarantee this gradual vanishing. One may wander why we didn't take $s_{\hat{k}} = l + L_{\hat{k}}$ in (3.8). The reason is that the first soliton may blow-up at some time $s \in [s_{\hat{k}+1}, l + L_{\hat{k}}]$, as one can see from direct computations based on the expressions of $\bar{d}_1$, $\bar{\nu}_1$ (3.9) and D_1 (3.3). As a matter of fact, a whole step of our argument is devoted to the proof that this is not the case (see (ii) of Claim 3.11 below where we will prove that indeed $s_{\hat{k}} = l + L_{\hat{k}}$).

We also claim the following:

Claim 3.5 *There exists* $C_0 > 0$ *such that for all* $m \in [\hat{k}, k]$, $L_m > 0$, *if* L_{m+1} *is large enough and* $x < 0$ *close enough to* 0, *then for all* $s \in [s_{m+1}, s_m]$, *we have*

$$\forall i = 1, ..., m, \qquad -1 + e^{-(p-1)L_m} \le \frac{\bar{\nu}_i(s)}{1 - |\bar{d}_i(s)|} \le C_0 e_m^L, \tag{3.24}$$

$$\forall i = 1, ..., m-1, \qquad \bar{\zeta}_{i+1}^*(s) - \bar{\zeta}_i^*(s) \ge \frac{(p-1)}{7} \log L_{m+1}, \tag{3.25}$$

where

$$\bar{\zeta}_i^*(s) = -\operatorname{argth}\left(\frac{\bar{d}_i(s)}{1 + \bar{\nu}_i(s)}\right). \tag{3.26}$$

Proof: See Appendix B. ■

Proof of Proposition 3.1: We proceed by induction for m decreasing from k to $\hat{k}$. Let us assume that

$$\begin{array}{rl} \textbf{either} & m = k, \\ \textbf{or} & \hat{k} \le m \le k-1 \text{ and Proposition 3.1 holds at the level } m+1. \end{array} \tag{3.27}$$

We then consider some $L_m > 0$. We first need to check that Proposition 3.1 holds for $s = s_{m+1}$.

Lemma 3.6 (Estimate of $(w_x(s_{m+1}), \partial_s w_x(s_{m+1}))$ on $(-1, 1)$) *Under (3.27), it holds that*

$$\lim_{L_{m+1}\to\infty} \left(\lim_{x\to 0^-} \left\| \begin{pmatrix} w_x(s_{m+1}) \\ \partial_s w_x(s_{m+1}) \end{pmatrix} - \sum_{i=1}^{m} (-1)^i \kappa^* \left(\bar{d}_i(s_{m+1}), \bar{\nu}_i(s_{m+1})\right) \right\|_{\mathcal{H}} \right) = 0.$$

Proof:

Case $m = k$: We will in fact prove that for all $\epsilon > 0$, there is $L^* > 0$ such that for all $L_{k+1} \ge L^*$, there exists $\delta(L_{k+1}) > 0$ such that for all $x \in [-\delta, 0)$,

$$\left\| \begin{pmatrix} w_x(s_{k+1}) \\ \partial_s w_x(s_{k+1}) \end{pmatrix} - \sum_{i=1}^{k} (-1)^i \kappa^* \left(\bar{d}_i(s_{k+1}), \bar{\nu}_i(s_{k+1})\right) \right\|_{\mathcal{H}} \le \epsilon.$$

Consider $\epsilon > 0$ and from (3.2) take L_{k+1} large enough such that for all $S \geq L_{k+1} - 1$, we have

$$\left\| \begin{pmatrix} W(S) \\ \partial_s W(S) \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} \sum_{i=1}^{k} (-1)^i \kappa(D_i(S)) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq \epsilon. \tag{3.28}$$

Note that for all $i = 1, ..., k$,

$$\left\| \kappa^* \left(\bar{d}_i(s_{k+1}), \bar{\nu}_i(s_{k+1}) \right) - \begin{pmatrix} \kappa(D_i(s_{k+1})) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\|_{\mathcal{H}} \to 0 \text{ as } x \to 0^- \tag{3.29}$$

(where we recall from (3.6) that $s_{k+1} = L_{k+1}$), from the definition (3.9) of $\bar{d}_i$ and $\bar{\nu}_i$ together with the continuity estimate in (ii) of Lemma A.2.
Then, using the fact that $b > 0$ (see (3.5)) and the solution of the Cauchy problem for equation (1.1), we see that for some $K = K(L_{k+1}) > 0$ and $\delta = \delta(L_{k+1}) > 0$, we have for all $t \in [-e^{-L_{k+1}+1}, -e^{-L_{k+1}-1}]$,

$$\|(u(t), u_t(t))\|_{H^1 \times L^2(|x|<(1+\delta)(-t))} \leq K(L_{k+1}).$$

Using the selfsimilar transformation, we see that for some $K'(L_{k+1}) > 0$ and for all $S \in [s_{k+1} - 1, s_{k+1} + 1]$, we have

$$\|(W(S), \partial_s W(S))\|_{H^1 \times L^2(|Y|<1+\delta)} \leq K'(L_{k+1})$$

and W uniformly continuous for $S \in [s_{k+1} - 1, s_{k+1} + 1]$. Using the transformation (3.18) (in particular (3.19) and the relations in (i) of Claim B.1), we see that when $m = k$, Lemma 3.6 follows from Lebesgue's Theorem, (3.29) and (3.28).

Case $\hat{k} \leq m \leq k - 1$: Consider $\epsilon > 0$. Since $k \geq m + 1 \geq \hat{k} + 1$, Claim 3.4 applies and we can fix $L_{m+1} > 0$ large enough so that

$$\left\| \kappa^* \left(\bar{d}_{m+1}(s_{m+1}), \bar{\nu}_{m+1}(s_{m+1}) \right) \right\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2} \tag{3.30}$$

and Proposition 3.1 applies at the level $m + 1$ (induction hypothesis). Hence, it follows that fixing L_{m+2} large enough and taking $|x|$ small enough, we have

$$\left\| \begin{pmatrix} w_x(s_{m+1}) \\ \partial_s w_x(s_{m+1}) \end{pmatrix} - \sum_{i=1}^{m+1} (-1)^i \kappa^* \left(\bar{d}_i(s_{m+1}), \bar{\nu}_i(s_{m+1}) \right) \right\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2}.$$

Thus, using (3.30), we see that

$$\left\| \begin{pmatrix} w_x(s_{m+1}) \\ \partial_s w_x(s_{m+1}) \end{pmatrix} - \sum_{i=1}^{m} (-1)^i \kappa^* \left(\bar{d}_i(s_{m+1}), \bar{\nu}_i(s_{m+1}) \right) \right\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq \epsilon,$$

which concludes the proof of Lemma 3.6. ■

From Lemma 3.6 and Claim 3.5, we see that for L_{m+1} large enough, $|x|$ small enough and $s = s_{m+1}$, $w_x(s_{m+1})$ is close to a sum of m decoupled solitons. We will in fact show that this decomposition propagates for all $s \in [s_{m+1}, s_m]$. To do so, we need a Lyapunov functional to control the error between our solution and such a sum. The modulation technique of Proposition 2.1 is crucial in obtaining such a Lyapunov function.

Using Lemma 3.6 and Claim 3.5, we see that for L_{m+1} large enough and $|x|$ small enough, the modulation technique of Proposition 2.1 applies at $s = s_{m+1}$ (in fact, it applies on a small interval to the right of s_{m+1}, thanks to the continuity in $\mathcal{H}$ of $(w_x(s), \partial_s w_x(s))$ as a function of s). More precisely, there are $(d_i(s), \nu_i(s))$ such that for all $\epsilon > 0$ small enough, there exists $\bar{s} = \bar{s}(\epsilon)$ maximal in $(s_{m+1}, s_m]$ such that for all $s \in [s_{m+1}, \bar{s}]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{for } l = 0,\ 1, \qquad & \pi_l^{d_i^*(s)}(q(s)) = 0, && (3.31)\\ & \|q(s_{m+1})\|_{\mathcal{H}} \le \beta\epsilon, && (3.32)\\ & \|q(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}} \le \epsilon, && (3.33)\\ \forall i = 1, ..., m-1, \qquad & \zeta_{i+1}^*(s) - \zeta_i^*(s) \ge \frac{(p-1)}{9}\log L_{m+1}, && (3.34)\\ \text{and} \qquad & -1 + \frac{e^{-(p-1)L_m}}{2} \le \frac{\nu_i(s)}{1-|d_i(s)|} \le C_0 e^{L_m} + 1, && (3.35) \end{aligned}$$

where $\pi_l^{d_i^*}$ is defined in (2.1),

$$q = \left(\begin{array}{c} q_1 \\ q_2 \end{array}\right) = \left(\begin{array}{c} w_x \\ \partial_s w_x \end{array}\right) - \sum_{i=1}^{m} (-1)^i \kappa^*(d_i, \nu_i), \tag{3.36}$$

$d_i^* = \frac{d_i}{1+\nu_i} = -\tanh \zeta_i^*$, C_0 is given in Claim 3.5 and $\beta \in (0,1)$ will be fixed later small enough. One should keep in mind that q and the above mentioned variables depend also on x and m. For simplicity in the notation, we omit that dependence.

Since $\bar{s}$ is maximal in $(s_{m+1}, s_m]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\textbf{either} \quad \bar{s} = s_m, && (3.37)\\ &\textbf{or} \quad \bar{s} < s_m \text{ and there is an equality case in (3.33)-(3.35)}. \end{aligned}$$

Our goal is to prove that $\bar{s} = s_m$. Using Lemmas A.2 and 3.2, we have the following:

Claim 3.7 *If L_m is fixed large enough, $\epsilon \le \epsilon_1(L_m)$, $L_{m+1} \ge L_{m+1,1}(L_m, \epsilon)$ and $|x| \le a_1(L_m, \epsilon, L_{m+1})$ for some $\epsilon_1 > 0$, $L_{m+1,1} > 0$ and a_1, then we have for all $s \in [s_{m+1}, \bar{s}]$:*
(i) For all $i = 1, ..., m$,

$$\left|\frac{\nu_i(s)}{1-|d_i(s)|} - \frac{\bar{\nu}_i(s)}{1-|\bar{d}_i(s)|}\right| + |\operatorname{argth} d_i(s) - \operatorname{argth} \bar{d}_i(s)| + |\zeta_i^*(s) - \bar{\zeta}_i^*(s)| \le C(L_m)\epsilon.$$

(ii) $\|\bar{q}(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}} \le C(L_m)\epsilon$ *where* $\bar{q} = \left(\begin{array}{c} \bar{q}_1 \\ \bar{q}_2 \end{array}\right) = \left(\begin{array}{c} w_x \\ \partial_s w_x \end{array}\right) - \sum_{i=1}^{m} (-1)^i \kappa^*(\bar{d}_i, \bar{\nu}_i)$.

Proof: See Appendix B. ■

From Claim 3.7, we see that it is enough to prove that

$$\bar{s} = s_m$$

in order to conclude the proof of Proposition 3.1, provided that L_m is fixed large enough, ϵ is small enough in terms of L_m, L_{m+1} is large enough in terms of L_m and ϵ and $|x|$ is small enough in terms of L_m, ϵ and L_{m+1}. From (3.37), we need to prove that all the inequalities in (3.33)-(3.35) are strict. This is the aim of the remaining part of the proof.

We claim the following:

Claim 3.8 (Remarkable functionals for q**)** *If L_m is large enough, then there exist C^1 functions h_1 and h_2 defined for all $s \in [s_{m+1}, \bar{s}]$ and constants $C_*(L_m) > 0$, $\delta^*(L_m) > 0$ and $\eta_0(L_m) > 0$ such that if $\epsilon \le \epsilon_2(L_m)$, $L_{m+1} \ge L_{m+1,2}(L_m, \epsilon)$ and $|x| \le a_2(L_m, \epsilon, L_{m+1})$ for some $\epsilon_2 > 0$, $L_{m+1,2} > 0$ and $a_2 > 0$, then for all $s \in [s_{m+1}, \bar{s}]$,*
(i) $\frac{1}{C_*}\|q(s)\|^2_{\mathcal{H}} \le h_1(s) \le C_*\|q(s)\|^2_{\mathcal{H}}$ and $h_1'(s) \le \frac{1}{\delta^*}h_1(s) + \frac{1}{\delta^*}J_m(s)^2$ where J_m is defined in (2.9).
(ii) $\left|(J_m(s)^2)'\right| \le \frac{1}{\delta^*}\left(\epsilon + \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{|\nu_i(s)|}{1-|d_i^*(s)|}\right) J_m(s)^2$ and $\left|(J_m(s)^2)'\right| \le \frac{1}{\delta^*}J_m(s)^2$.
(iii) If

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{|\nu_i(s)|}{1-|d_i^*(s)|} \le \eta_0, \tag{3.38}$$

then $\frac{1}{C_*}\|q(s)\|^2_{\mathcal{H}} \le h_2(s) \le C_*\|q(s)\|^2_{\mathcal{H}}$ and $h_2'(s) \le -\delta^* h_2(s) + \frac{1}{\delta^*}J_m(s)^2$.

Proof: The proof is similar to our analogous estimate in Section 3.2 of [17]. For that reason, we give it in Section C.2 in Appendix C, stressing only the differences with respect to [17]. ■

We now claim the following:

Claim 3.9 *If L_m is fixed large enough, $M_0 = M_0(L_m) > 0$ is large enough, $\epsilon \le \epsilon_3(L_m)$, $L_{m+1} \ge L_{m+1,3}(L_m, \epsilon)$ and $|x| \le a_3(L_m, \epsilon, L_{m+1})$ for some $\epsilon_3 > 0$, $L_{m+1,3} > 0$ and $a_3 > 0$, then:*
(i)

$$\forall s \in [s_{m+1}, \min(\bar{s}, s_m - M_0)], \quad \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{|\nu_i(s)|}{1-|d_i^*(s)|} \le \eta_0$$

where η_0 is given in Claim 3.8.
(ii) If we fix

$$\beta = \beta(L_m) = \frac{1}{2}\min\left(1, \frac{1}{C_*}, \frac{e^{-\frac{M_0}{\delta^*}}}{4C_*^2}\right) \tag{3.39}$$

where the different constants appear in Claim 3.8, then for all $s \in [s_{m+1}, \bar{s}]$ and $i = 1, ..., m-1$, we have

$$\begin{array}{ll} & \zeta_{i+1}^*(s) - \zeta_i^*(s) \ge \frac{(p-1)}{8}\log L_{m+1}, \quad -1 + \frac{3}{4}e^{-(p-1)L_m} \le \frac{\nu_i(s)}{1-|d_i(s)|} \le C_0 e^{L_m} + \frac{1}{2}, \\ \text{and} & \|q(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}} \le \frac{\epsilon}{\sqrt{2}} \end{array} \tag{3.40}$$

where C_0 appears in (3.35).

Proof:
(i) See Appendix B.
(ii) Note that the two first estimates of (3.40) directly follow from Claims 3.5 and 3.7, if L_m is fixed large enough, $\epsilon \le \epsilon_4(L_m)$, $L_{m+1} \ge L_{m+1,4}(L_m, \epsilon)$ and $|x| \le a_4(L_m, \epsilon, L_{m+1})$ for some $\epsilon_4 > 0$, $L_{m+1,4} > 0$ and $a_4 > 0$. Thus, we only focus on the third estimate which is more delicate.
Consider $M_0 > 0$ to be fixed later in terms of L_m. If $s \in [s_{m+1}, \min(\bar{s}, s_m - M_0)]$, then we see from (i) of this claim, (ii) and (iii) of Claim 3.8 that for ϵ and η_0 small enough, we have

$$\left(h_2 - \frac{2}{\delta^{*2}} J_m^2\right)' \le -\delta^* \left(h_2 - \frac{2}{\delta^{*2}} J_m^2\right).$$

Integrating this inequality and using (iii) of Claim 3.8, we write

$$\|q(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \le C_*^2 e^{-\delta^*(s-s_{m+1})} \|q(s_{m+1})\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 + 2\frac{C_*}{\delta^{*2}} J_m(s)^2.$$

Using the definition (2.9) of J_m, (3.32) and (3.34), we write

$$\|q(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \le C_*^2 e^{-\delta^*(s-s_{m+1})} \beta^2 \epsilon^2 + 2\frac{C_*}{\delta^{*2}} (k-1)^2 {L_{m+1}}^{-1/9} \le 2C_*^2 \beta^2 \epsilon^2 \le \frac{\epsilon^2}{2},$$

provided that $L_{m+1} = L_{m+1}(L_m, \epsilon)$ is large enough and $\beta = \beta(L_m)$ is fixed by (3.39). Thus, we get the conclusion when $s \in [s_{m+1}, \min(\bar{s}, s_m - M_0)]$.
Now, if $\bar{s} > s_m - M_0$ and $s \in [s_m - M_0, \bar{s}]$, we have just proved that

$$\|q(s_m - M_0)\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \le 2C_*^2 \beta^2 \epsilon^2. \tag{3.41}$$

Using (i) and (ii) of Claim 3.8, we write

$$(h_1 + J_m^2)' \le \frac{2}{\delta^*}(h_1 + J_m^2).$$

Integrating this between $s_m - M_0$ and $\bar{s}$, we write from (i) of Claim 3.8,

$$\|q(\bar{s})\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \le C_* e^{\frac{2}{\delta^*}(\bar{s} - s_m + M_0)} \left(C_* \|q(s_m - M_0)\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 + J_m(s_m - M_0)^2\right). \tag{3.42}$$

Since $\bar{s} \le s_m$ by definition of $\bar{s}$, we get from (3.42), (3.41), the definition (2.9) of J_m, (3.34) and (3.39),

$$\|q(\bar{s})\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \le C_* e^{\frac{2M_0}{\delta^*}} \left(2C_*^3 \beta^2 \epsilon^2 + (k-1)^2 {L_{m+1}}^{-1/9}\right) \le 4C_*^4 \beta^2 e^{\frac{2M_0}{\delta^*}} \epsilon^2 \le \frac{\epsilon^2}{2},$$

provided that $L_{m+1} = L_{m+1}(L_m, \epsilon)$ is large enough. This concludes the proof of Claim 3.9. ■

In conclusion, for all $\epsilon > 0$, $s \in [s_{m+1}, \bar{s}]$ and $i = 1, ..., m-1$, we have just proved in Claim 3.9 that

$$\zeta_{i+1}^*(s) - \zeta_i^*(s) \ge \frac{(p-1)}{8} \log L_{m+1}, \quad -1 + \frac{3}{4} e^{-(p-1)L_m} \le \frac{\nu_i(s)}{1 - |d_i(s)|} \le C_0 e^{L_m} + \frac{1}{2},$$

and

$$\|q(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq \frac{\epsilon}{\sqrt{2}}$$

for well chosen parameters. From the alternative (3.37), we see that

$$\bar{s} = s_m.$$

Using (ii) of Claim 3.7, we see that for all $s \in [s_{m+1}, s_m]$, we have

$$\left\| \begin{pmatrix} w_x(s) \\ \partial_s w_x(s) \end{pmatrix} - \sum_{i=1}^{m} (-1)^i \kappa^*(\bar{d}_i(s), \bar{\nu}_i(s)) \right\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq C(L_m)\epsilon.$$

This concludes the proof of Proposition 3.1. ■

3.2 Proof of Theorems 1 and 2

This section is devoted to the proof of the following result which directly implies Theorems 1 and 2:

Proposition 3.10 (More properties of $\mathcal{S}$) *There exists $\delta_0 > 0$ such that if $-\delta_0 \leq x < 0$, then for some $C_0 > 0$, we have:*

$$\begin{array}{ll} (i) & E(w_x(s)) < 2E(\kappa_0) \text{ for some } s \geq -\log T(x), \\ (ii) & \dfrac{1}{C_0 |\log|x||^{\gamma_1}} \leq T'(x) - 1 \leq \dfrac{C_0}{|\log|x||^{\gamma_1}}. \end{array}$$

Let us first derive Theorems 1 and 2 from this proposition and then prove it.

Consider $u(x,t)$ a blow-up solution of equation (1.1) and $x_0 \in \mathcal{S}$. Since equation (1.1) is invariant under space and time translation as well as symmetry in space, we may assume that $x_0 = 0$ and $T(x_0) = 0$ and focus on the case $x < 0$.

Proof of Theorem 1 assuming that Proposition 3.10 holds: Applying Proposition 3.10, we see that for some $\delta_0 > 0$, if $-\delta_0 \leq x < 0$, then $E(w_x(s)) < 2E(\kappa_0)$ for some $s \geq -\log T(x)$. Using (i) of Proposition 1.2, we see that $x \in \mathcal{R}$. Since the same property holds for $x > 0$ by symmetry, we see that 0 is an isolated characteristic point and Theorem 1 follows from Proposition 3.10. ■

Proof of Theorem 2 assuming that Proposition 3.10 holds: It follows from (ii) of Proposition 3.10 and the definition (3.3) of γ_1.

It remains to prove Proposition 3.10.

Proof of Proposition 3.10:

We work with the formulation given in the beginning of Section 3 and in Section 3.1. We proceed in 3 steps: In Step 1, we consider $x < 0$ and give an upper bound on the energy of $w_x(s_{\hat{k}})$ where $s_{\hat{k}}$ is defined in (3.8). Using the lower bound of (1.17), we show that $s_{\hat{k}} = l + L_{\hat{k}}$ in (3.8), if $L_{\hat{k}}$ is large enough and $|x|$ is small enough. Then, in Step 2, we conclude the proof of Proposition 3.10.

Step 1: An upper bound on $E(w_x(s_{\hat{k}}))$ for small $|x|$ and applications

This step is dedicated to the proof of the following:

Claim 3.11 (An upper bound on $E(w_x(s_{\hat{k}}))$ for small $|x|$ and applications) *There exists $L_{\hat{k},1} > 0$ such that for all $L_{\hat{k}} \geq L_{\hat{k},1}$ and for all $\epsilon^* > 0$, there exists $\delta(L_{\hat{k}}, \epsilon^*) > 0$ such that for all $x \in [-\delta, 0)$, we have:*
(i) $E(w_x(s_{\hat{k}})) \leq E(\kappa_0)\left(\frac{p+1}{p-1}\bar{\lambda}_1^2 - \frac{2}{p-1}\bar{\lambda}_1^{p+1} + \epsilon^*\bar{\lambda}_1^{p+1}\right) + C(\epsilon^* + \sum_{i=2}^{\hat{k}}\bar{\lambda}_i)(1+\bar{\lambda}_1^p)$, where

$$\bar{\lambda}_i = \lambda(\bar{d}_i(s_{\hat{k}}), \bar{\nu}_i(s_{\hat{k}})) \tag{3.43}$$

and $\lambda(d,\nu)$ is defined in (3.23).
(ii) $s_{\hat{k}} = l + L_{\hat{k}}$,
(iii) For all $i = 2, ..., \hat{k}$, $\bar{\lambda}_i \leq Ce^{-\frac{L_{\hat{k}}}{p-1}}$ and $|\bar{\lambda}_1 - 1|^2 \leq C(\epsilon^* + e^{-\frac{L_{\hat{k}}}{p-1}})$.

Remark: If $k=2$, then $\hat{k} = E\left(\frac{k+1}{2}\right) = 1$ and $\sum_{i=2}^{\hat{k}} \bar{\lambda}_i = 0$.
Proof: Consider $L_{\hat{k}} > 0$ and $\epsilon^* \in (0,1]$.

(i) From Proposition 3.1 applied with $m = \hat{k}$, we consider $\delta_1 = \delta_1(L_{\hat{k}}, \epsilon^*) > 0$ such that for all $x \in [-\delta_1, 0)$, we have

$$\left\| \begin{pmatrix} w_x(y, s_{\hat{k}}) \\ \partial_s w_x(y, s_{\hat{k}}) \end{pmatrix} - \sum_{i=1}^{\hat{k}} (-1)^i \kappa^*\left(\bar{d}_i(s_{\hat{k}}), \bar{\nu}_i(s_{\hat{k}}), y\right) \right\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq \epsilon^*. \tag{3.44}$$

Since we have for some $\delta_2 = \delta_2(L, \epsilon^*) > 0$ and for all $x \in [-\delta_2, 0]$ (see below for a proof of this fact),

$$\frac{|\bar{\nu}_1(s_{\hat{k}})|}{\sqrt{1 - \bar{d}_1(s_{\hat{k}})^2}} \leq \epsilon^* \text{ and } \forall i = 1, ..., \hat{k}, \ \ \|\kappa^*(\bar{d}_i(s_{\hat{k}}), \bar{\nu}_i(s_{\hat{k}}), \cdot)\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq C\bar{\lambda}_i \tag{3.45}$$

with

$$\bar{\lambda}_i \leq 1 \text{ when } 2 \leq i \leq \hat{k}, \tag{3.46}$$

we write from (3.44)

$$\left\| \begin{pmatrix} w_x(y, s_{\hat{k}}) \\ \partial_s w_x(y, s_{\hat{k}}) \end{pmatrix} + \kappa^*(\bar{d}_1(s_{\hat{k}}), \bar{\nu}_1(s_{\hat{k}}), y) \right\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq \epsilon^* + C\sum_{i=2}^{\hat{k}} \bar{\lambda}_i. \tag{3.47}$$

Applying (iii) of Claim A.1, we write from (3.45), (3.46) and (3.47)

$$E(w_x(s_{\hat{k}})) \leq E(\kappa^*(\bar{d}_1(s_{\hat{k}}), \bar{\nu}_1(s_{\hat{k}}), \cdot)) + C(\epsilon^* + \sum_{i=2}^{\hat{k}} \bar{\lambda}_i)(1 + \bar{\lambda}_1^p).$$

Using (i) of Lemma A.2 and (3.45), we get (i) of Claim 3.11 with $\delta = \min(\delta_1, \delta_2)$. It remains to prove (3.45) and (3.46).

Proof of (3.45) and (3.46): Note first from (3.8), (3.9), (3.3) and (3.10) that

$$S_{\hat{k}} \to \infty \text{ and } s_{\hat{k}} \to \infty \text{ as } x \to 0^-, \tag{3.48}$$

with (use (3.5))

$$s_{\hat{k}} \le l + L_{\hat{k}}, \text{ and } S_{\hat{k}} \le -\log(-x(1-b)) \le l + C \tag{3.49}$$

for $|x|$ small enough. Therefore, using (3.3), we see that

$$\forall i = 1, ..., \hat{k}, \ \frac{C}{l^{\gamma_i}} \le 1 - \bar{d}_i(s_{\hat{k}}) \to 0 \text{ as } x \to 0^-. \tag{3.50}$$

Using the bound (3.5) on b, we write from the definition (3.9) of $\bar{\nu}_i(s_{\hat{k}})$, (3.49) and (3.50)

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{|\bar{\nu}_1(s_{\hat{k}})|}{\sqrt{1-\bar{d}_1(s_{\hat{k}})^2}} &\le \left(\frac{b}{\sqrt{1-\bar{d}_1(s_{\hat{k}})}} + \sqrt{1-\bar{d}_1(s_{\hat{k}})}\right) e^{L_{\hat{k}}} \\ &\le \left(\frac{C}{l^{\gamma_1/2}} + \sqrt{1-\bar{d}_1(s_{\hat{k}})}\right) e^{L_{\hat{k}}} \to 0 \end{aligned} \tag{3.51}$$

as $x \to 0$, and the first part of (3.45) is proved.
Since we see from (3.8) and (3.9) that

$$1 + \bar{\nu}_1(s_{\hat{k}}) - \bar{d}_1(s_{\hat{k}}) \ge e^{-(p-1)L_{\hat{k}}}(1 - \bar{d}_1(s_{\hat{k}})), \tag{3.52}$$

we write from the definitions (3.23) and (3.43) of λ and $\bar{\lambda}_i$, (3.50) and (3.51), for $|x|$ small enough with $x < 0$,

$$\bar{\lambda}_1^{p-1} = \frac{1-\bar{d}_1(s_{\hat{k}})}{1+\bar{\nu}_1(s_{\hat{k}})-\bar{d}_1(s_{\hat{k}})} \cdot \frac{1+\bar{d}_1(s_{\hat{k}})}{1+\bar{\nu}_1(s_{\hat{k}})+\bar{d}_1(s_{\hat{k}})} \le e^{(p-1)L_{\hat{k}}} \cdot 2^{p-1},$$

hence

$$\bar{\lambda}_1 \le 2e^{L_{\hat{k}}}.$$

Taking $|x|$ small enough with $x < 0$, we see from (i) of Lemma A.2 and (3.51) that the second identity in (3.45) holds for $i = 1$.
When $2 \le i \le \hat{k}$, using the bound (3.5) on b and (3.49), we see from (3.50) and by definition (3.9) that $\bar{\nu}_i(s_{\hat{k}}) \ge 0$, hence by definition (3.23), $\bar{\lambda}_i \le 1$ and (3.46) follows. Applying (i) of Lemma A.2, we see that the second identity in (3.45) holds for $2 \le i \le \hat{k}$. This concludes the proof of (3.45), (3.46) and the proof of (i) in Claim 3.11 too.

(ii) Taking $\epsilon^* \le \frac{1}{p-1}$ and using the fact that $\bar{\lambda}_i \le 1$ when $2 \le i \le \hat{k}$ (see (3.46)), we write from (i) of Claim 3.11 and (1.17)

$$E(\kappa_0) \le E(\kappa_0)\left(\frac{p+1}{p-1}\bar{\lambda}_1^2 - \frac{1}{p-1}\bar{\lambda}_1^{p+1}\right) + C(1+\bar{\lambda}_1^p) \equiv h_0(\bar{\lambda}_1).$$

Since $\bar{\lambda}_1 > 0$ by the definition (3.23) and

$$h_0(\lambda) \to -\infty \text{ as } \lambda \to \infty,$$

it follows that for some $C_0 > 0$,

$$0 < \bar{\lambda}_1 \le C_0 \tag{3.53}$$

on the one hand.
On the other hand, using (3.45) and (3.50), we see from (3.23) and (3.13) that if Case 2 occurs, then

$$\bar\lambda_1^{p-1} = \frac{1-\bar d_1(s_{\hat k})}{1+\bar\nu_1(s_{\hat k})-\bar d_1(s_{\hat k})}\cdot\frac{1+\bar d_1(s_{\hat k})}{1+\bar\nu_1(s_{\hat k})+\bar d_1(s_{\hat k})} \geq e^{(p-1)L_{\hat k}}\cdot\frac{1}{2^{p-1}},$$

hence

$$\bar\lambda_1 \geq \frac{e^{L_{\hat k}}}{2}. \tag{3.54}$$

for $|x|$ small enough. If $L_{\hat k} \geq L_{\hat k,1}$ where we fix

$$e^{L_{\hat k,1}} = 4C_0$$

and C_0 is given in (3.53), then we see from (3.53) and (3.54) that Case 2 given in (3.13) cannot occur. Therefore, Case 1 (given in (3.8)) holds and $s_{\hat k} = l + L_{\hat k}$. Thus, (ii) of Claim 3.11 is proved.

(iii) Since $s_{\hat k} = l + L_{\hat k}$ by (ii) of Claim 3.11, we see from Claim 3.4 and the definition (3.43) of $\bar\lambda_i$ that

$$\bar\lambda_i \leq Ce^{-\frac{L_{\hat k}}{p-1}} \text{ when } 2 \leq i \leq \hat k. \tag{3.55}$$

Using (3.55), (i) of Claim 3.11, (1.17) and (3.53), we see that

$$E(\kappa_0) - C(\epsilon^* + e^{-\frac{L_{\hat k}}{p-1}}) \leq E(\kappa_0)\left(\frac{p+1}{p-1}\bar\lambda_1^2 - \frac{2}{p-1}\bar\lambda_1^{p+1}\right) \equiv E(\kappa_0)h(\bar\lambda_1). \tag{3.56}$$

Since the maximum of h is $h(1) = E(\kappa_0)$ and since it is achieved only for $\bar\lambda_1 = 1$, we get from the fact that $h'(1) = 0$ and $h"(1) \neq 0$,

$$|\bar\lambda_1 - 1|^2 \leq C(\epsilon^* + e^{-\frac{L_{\hat k}}{p-1}}). \tag{3.57}$$

This concludes the proof of Claim 3.11. ■

Step 2: Conclusion of the proof of Proposition 3.10:
Using (i) of Lemma A.2, (3.45) and (3.57), we see that (3.47) and (3.55) yield

$$\left\|\begin{pmatrix} w_x(y,s_{\hat k}) \\ \partial_s w_x(y,s_{\hat k})\end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} \kappa\left(\bar d_1^*(s_{\hat k}), y\right) \\ 0\end{pmatrix}\right\|_{\mathcal H} \leq C_1(\sqrt{\epsilon^*} + e^{-\frac{L_{\hat k}}{2(p-1)}}) \tag{3.58}$$

for some $C_1 > 0$, where $\bar d_1^*(s_{\hat k}) = \frac{\bar d_1(s_{\hat k})}{1+\bar\nu_1(s_{\hat k})} = \frac{\bar d_1(s_{\hat k})}{1+\bar\nu_1(s_{\hat k})}$. From (i), (ii) and (iii) of Claim A.1, we see that

$$E(w_x(s_{\hat k})) \leq E(\kappa_0) + C_2(\sqrt{\epsilon^*} + e^{-\frac{L}{2(p-1)}}) \tag{3.59}$$

for some $C_2 > 0$. Fixing

$$L_{\hat k} = \max\left(L_{\hat k,1}, 2(p-1)\left(|\log\left|\frac{\epsilon_0}{2C_1}\right|\right|, 2(p-1))\left|\log\left|\frac{E(\kappa_0)}{4C_1}\right|\right|\right) \tag{3.60}$$

where ϵ_0 appears in the trapping result of [15] stated in (ii) of Proposition 1.2 and fix ϵ^* small enough so that

$$\epsilon^* \le \min\left(\frac{1}{p-1}, \left(\frac{\epsilon_0}{2C_1}\right)^2, \left(\frac{E(\kappa_0)}{4C_1}\right)^2\right), \tag{3.61}$$

we see from (3.59) that

$$E(w_x(s_{\hat{k}})) \le E(\kappa_0) + \epsilon_0 \le \frac{3}{2}E(\kappa_0),$$

(note that we also have

$$\left\| \begin{pmatrix} w_x(y,s_{\hat{k}}) \\ \partial_s w_x(y,s_{\hat{k}}) \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} \kappa\left(\bar{d}_1^*(s_{\hat{k}}),y\right) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\|_{\mathcal{H}} \le \epsilon_0), \tag{3.62}$$

which concludes the proof of (i) of Proposition 3.10.

(ii) Using (ii) of Proposition 1.2, we see that for $|x|$ small enough, we have for some $C_0 > 0$,

$$\left|\operatorname{argth}(T'(x)) - \operatorname{argth}\left(\bar{d}_1^*(s_{\hat{k}})\right)\right| \le C_0\epsilon_0 \tag{3.63}$$

Since we have from (3.52), (ii) of Claim 3.11 and the positivity of b (see (3.5))

$$e^{-(p-1)L_{\hat{k}}}(1-\bar{d}_1(s_{\hat{k}})) \le 1 + \bar{\nu}_1(s_{\hat{k}}) - \bar{d}_1(s_{\hat{k}}) \le (1-\bar{d}_1(s_{\hat{k}}))(e^{L_{\hat{k}}}+1),$$

and from (3.48), (3.3) and (3.45)

$$\frac{1}{Cl^{\gamma_1}} \le 1 - \bar{d}_1(s_{\hat{k}}) \le \frac{C}{l^{\gamma_1}}, \quad \bar{\nu}_1(s_{\hat{k}}) \to 0 \text{ as } x \to 0^-,$$

we write from the definition (3.9) of $\bar{\nu}_1(s_{\hat{k}})$,

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{argth}\left(\bar{d}_1^*(s_{\hat{k}})\right) &= \operatorname{argth}\left(\frac{\bar{d}_1(s_{\hat{k}})}{1+\bar{\nu}_1(s_{\hat{k}})}\right) = \frac{1}{2}\log\left(\frac{1+\bar{\nu}_1(s_{\hat{k}})+\bar{d}_1(s_{\hat{k}})}{1+\bar{\nu}_1(s_{\hat{k}})-\bar{d}_1(s_{\hat{k}})}\right) \\ &= -\frac{1}{2}\log\left(1-\bar{d}_1(s_{\hat{k}})+\bar{\nu}_1(s_{\hat{k}})\right) + O(1) \\ &= -\frac{1}{2}\log(1-\bar{d}_1(s_{\hat{k}})) + O(1) = \frac{\gamma_1}{2}\log l + O(1) \end{aligned}$$

as $x \to 0^-$. Using (3.63), we see that

$$T'(x) = -\tanh\left(\frac{\gamma_1}{2}\log l + O(1)\right) = -1 + l^{-\gamma_1}e^{O(1)} \text{ as } x \to 0^-$$

and (ii) follows. This concludes the proof of Proposition 3.10 as well as Theorems 1 and 2. ■

3.3 The blow-up speed in L^∞ near a characteristic point

We prove Corollary 1.1 here. Note that it is a consequence of our anaysis in this section. In particular, the lower bound on $T(x)$ in (1.5) is crucial for our argument.

Proof of Corollary 1.1: Consider $x_0 \in \mathcal{S}$. As in section 3, we assume from translation invariance of equation (1.1) that $x_0 = T(x_0) = 0$, hence,

$$0 \in \mathcal{S} \text{ and } T(0) = 0.$$

We will also use the notation $W(Y,S)$ instead of $w_0(y,s)$ defined in the selfsimilar transformation (1.6). Up to replacing u by $-u$, we see from Proposition 1.3 that (3.2) and (3.3) hold for some integer $k = k(0) \geq 2$, for some continuous functions $D_i(S)$, $C_0 > 0$ and $S_0 \in \mathbb{R}$. Using the Hardy-Sobolev estimate of (A.1) and introducing

$$\bar{W}(\xi,S) = (1-Y^2)^{\frac{1}{p-1}} W(Y,S),\ \ Y = \tanh\xi \text{ and } \zeta_i(S) = -\operatorname{argth} D_i(S), \tag{3.64}$$

we see that

$$\left\| \bar{W}(\xi,S) - \sum_{i=1}^{k} (-1)^i \kappa_0 \cosh^{-\frac{2}{p-1}}(\xi - \zeta_i(S)) \right\|_{L^\infty} \to 0 \text{ as } S \to \infty \tag{3.65}$$

From (1.6), our goal that for S large enough,

$$\frac{S^{\frac{k-1}{2}}}{C} \leq \|W(S)\|_{L^\infty(-1,1)} \leq CS^{\frac{k-1}{2}}. \tag{3.66}$$

We first prove the lower bound, then the upper bound.

- *The lower bound*: Since

$$\|W(S)\|_{L^\infty(-1,1)} \geq |W(-D_1(S),S)|$$

and from (3.3)

$$\frac{S^{-\frac{(p-1)(k-1)}{2}}}{C} \leq 1 - D_1(S) \leq CS^{-\frac{(p-1)(k-1)}{2}} \tag{3.67}$$

for S large enough, we write from (3.65), (3.64) and the definition (1.13) of κ_d,

$$|\bar{W}(\zeta_1(S),S)| \geq \frac{\kappa_0}{2},\text{ hence } |W(-D_1(S),S)| \geq \frac{1}{2}\kappa_{D_1(S)}(-D_1(S),S) \geq \frac{S^{\frac{k-1}{2}}}{C},$$

and the lower bound in (3.66) follows.

- *The upper bound*: The following uniform estimate is crucial for your argument. It follows from our analysis in the proof of Theorems 1 and 2.

Lemma 3.12 (Uniform bound on $w_x(s)$)*If $|x|$ is small enough and s is large enough, then*

$$\|w_x(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}} + \|(1-y^2)w_x(s)\|_{L^\infty(-1,1)} \leq C.$$

Let us first use this lemma to prove the upper bound in (3.66), then we will prove it. Up to making the symmetry $x \mapsto -x$ in equation (1.1), we may assume that

$$-1 < Y \le 0. \tag{3.68}$$

Introducing

$$X = -\frac{e^{-S}}{4}, \tag{3.69}$$

we see from (3.18) and (3.19) that

$$W(Y,S) = (1+(1-b)Xe^S)^{-\frac{2}{p-1}} w_X(y,s) \tag{3.70}$$

where

$$s = S - \log(1+(1-b)Xe^S),\ \ y = \frac{Y - Xe^S}{1+(1-b)Xe^S},\ \text{and } b = 1 - \frac{T(X)}{X}. \tag{3.71}$$

Since we have from (3.71) and (3.69) for S large enough,

$$\frac{|\log|X||^{-\frac{(p-1)(k-1)}{2}}}{C} \le b \le C|\log|X||^{-\frac{(p-1)(k-1)}{2}},\ \text{hence } \frac{S^{-\frac{(p-1)(k-1)}{2}}}{C} \le b \le CS^{-\frac{(p-1)(k-1)}{2}}$$

by Theorem 2 and

$$\begin{array}{rcl} 1+(1-b)Xe^S & = & \frac{3}{4} + \frac{b}{4} = \frac{3}{4} + O(S^{-\frac{(p-1)(k-1)}{2}}), \\ y & = & \frac{4Y+1}{3+b} \le \frac{1}{3}, \\ 1+y & = & \frac{4+4Y+b}{3+b} \ge \frac{b}{4} \ge \frac{S^{-\frac{(p-1)(k-1)}{2}}}{C}, \end{array}$$

by (3.69), (3.71), (3.68) and (3.67), we see from (3.70) and Lemma 3.12 that

$$|W(Y,S)| \le C|w_X(y,s)| \le C(1-y^2)^{-\frac{1}{p-1}} \le C(1+y)^{-\frac{1}{p-1}} \le CS^{\frac{k-1}{2}}$$

which is the desired conclusion. It remains to prove Lemma 3.12 in order to conclude the proof of Corollary 1.1.

Proof of Lemma (3.12): The bound on the weighted L^∞ space follow from the bound in $\mathcal{H}$ thanks to the Hardy-Sobolev estimate (A.1). Thus, we only prove the bound in $\mathcal{H}$.
- When $x = 0$, the result follows from Proposition 3.5 page 66 in [15]. Of course, the reader may see this bound as a consequence of the decomposition into solitons (3.2) (which is much stronger) and the boundedness of the solitons in $\mathcal{H}$ stated in (i) of Claim A.1.
- When $x \neq 0$, up to replacing x by $-x$ in equation (1.1), we may assume that $x < 0$. Therefore, the previous part of Section 3 applies.

If $s \in [L_{k+1}, s_{\hat{k}}]$, then the result follows from the application of Proposition 3.1, for all $m \in [k, \hat{k}]$ and (i) of Claim A.1, provided that the different constants L_{k+1},...,$L_{\hat{k}+1}$ are large enough and $|x|$ is small enough.

If $s \ge s_{\hat{k}}$, then we recall from (3.62) that for $|x|$ small enough, we have

$$\left\| \begin{pmatrix} w_x(y, s_{\hat{k}}) \\ \partial_s w_x(y, s_{\hat{k}}) \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} \kappa\left(\bar{d}_1^*(s_{\hat{k}}), y\right) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\|_{\mathcal{H}} \le \epsilon_0.$$

Thus, the trapping result of (ii) of Proposition 1.2 applies and we get for some positive μ_0 and C_0 and for all $s \geq s_{\hat{k}}$:

$$\left\| \begin{pmatrix} w_x(s) \\ \partial_s w_x(s) \end{pmatrix} - \theta(x_0) \begin{pmatrix} \kappa(T'(x)) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq C_0 e^{-\mu_0(s-s_0)}.$$

Using again (i) of Claim A.1, we get the conclusion. This concludes the proof of Lemma 3.12 and Corollary 1.1 too. ■

A Properties of $\kappa(d,y)$ and $\kappa^*(d,\nu,y)$

In this section, we give some properties of $\kappa(d,y)$ and $\kappa^*(d,\nu,y)$ defined in (1.13) and (1.14). We first recall the following:

Claim A.1 *(i)* **(Boundedness of $\kappa(d,y)$ in several norms)** *For all $d \in (-1,1)$, it holds that*

$$\|\kappa(d,y)\|_{L^{p+1}_\rho(-1,1)} + \|\kappa(d,y)(1-y^2)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}\|_{L^\infty(-1,1)} \leq C\|\kappa(d,y)\|_{\mathcal{H}_0} \leq CE(\kappa_0).$$

(ii) **(Same energy level for $\kappa(d,y)$)** *For all $d \in (-1,1)$, it holds that*

$$E(\pm\kappa(d,y)) = E(\kappa_0).$$

(iii) **(Continuity of the Lyapunov functional)** *If $(w_i(y,s), \partial_s w_i(y,s)) \in \mathcal{H}$ for $i = 1$ and 2 and for some $s \in \mathbb{R}$, then*

$$\begin{aligned} & |E(w_1(s)) - E(w_2(s))| \\ \leq\ & C\left\| \begin{pmatrix} w_1(s) \\ \partial_s w_1(s) \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} w_2(s) \\ \partial_s w_2(s) \end{pmatrix} \right\|_{\mathcal{H}} \left(1 + \left\| \begin{pmatrix} w_1(s) \\ \partial_s w_1(s) \end{pmatrix} \right\|_{\mathcal{H}}^p + \left\| \begin{pmatrix} w_2(s) \\ \partial_s w_2(s) \end{pmatrix} \right\|_{\mathcal{H}}^p \right). \end{aligned}$$

Proof: For (i), use identity (49) page 59 in [15] and the following Hardy Sobolev identity:

$$\forall h \in \mathcal{H}_0,\ \ \|h\|_{L^2_{\frac{\rho}{1-y^2}}(-1,1)} + \|h\|_{L^{p+1}_\rho(-1,1)} + \|h(1-y^2)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}\|_{L^\infty(-1,1)} \leq C\|h\|_{\mathcal{H}_0}. \tag{A.1}$$

For (ii), see (ii) of Proposition 1 page 47 in [15]. The proof of (iii) is straightforward from the definition (1.12) of $E(w)$. ■

Now, we give in the following lemma some properties of $\kappa^*(d,\nu,y)$ defined in (1.14) which are useful for the proof.

Lemma A.2 (Properties of $\kappa^*(d,\nu,y)$) *For all $d \in (-1,1)$ and $\nu > -1 + |d|$, we have:*
(i)

$$\begin{aligned} \forall y \in (-1,1),\ \ 0 \leq \kappa_1^*(d,\nu,y) = \lambda\kappa\left(\frac{d}{1+\nu}, y\right) &\leq \frac{\kappa_0\lambda}{(1-y^2)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}}, \\ \|\kappa^*(d,\nu)\|_{\mathcal{H}} &\leq C\lambda + C1_{\{\nu<0\}}\frac{|\nu|}{\sqrt{1-d^2}}\lambda^{\frac{p+1}{2}}, \\ \left\| \kappa^*(d,\nu) - \begin{pmatrix} \kappa\left(\frac{d}{1+\nu}\right) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\|_{\mathcal{H}} &\leq C|\lambda - 1| + C\frac{|\nu|}{\sqrt{1-d^2}}\lambda^{\frac{p+1}{2}} \\ E(\kappa_0) \geq E(\kappa^*(d,\nu)) = E(\kappa_0)\left(\frac{p+1}{p-1}\lambda^2 - \frac{2}{p-1}\lambda^{p+1}\right. &+ \left.\frac{2}{(p-1)}\frac{\nu^2}{(1-d^2)}\lambda^{p+1}\right) \end{aligned}$$

where λ *is defined in (3.23).*
(ii) For all $A \geq 2$*, there exists* $C(A) > 0$ *such that if* (d_1, ν_1) *and* (d_2, ν_2) *satisfy*

$$\frac{\nu_1}{1-|d_1|}, \frac{\nu_2}{1-|d_2|} \in [-1 + \frac{1}{A}, A], \tag{A.2}$$

then

$$\|\kappa^*(d_1,\nu_1) - \kappa^*(d_2,\nu_2)\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq C(A)\left(\left|\frac{\nu_1}{1-|d_1|} - \frac{\nu_2}{1-|d_2|}\right| + |\operatorname{argth} d_1 - \operatorname{argth} d_2|\right). \tag{A.3}$$

Moreover, there exists $\epsilon_0(A) > 0$ *such that if* $\|\kappa^*(d_1,\nu_1) - \kappa^*(d_2,\nu_2)\|_{\mathcal{H}_{1,2}} \leq \epsilon_0(A)$ *where*

$$\|V\|^2_{\mathcal{H}_{1,2}} = \int_{\tanh(\operatorname{argth}(\max_{i=1,2}(-\frac{d_i}{1+\nu_i}))+A)}^{1} \left(V_1^2 + V_1'^2(1-y^2) + V_2^2\right)\rho dy,$$

then

$$\left|\frac{\nu_1}{1-|d_1|} - \frac{\nu_2}{1-|d_2|}\right| + |\operatorname{argth} d_1 - \operatorname{argth} d_2| \leq C(A)\|\kappa^*(d_1,\nu_1) - \kappa^*(d_2,\nu_2)\|_{\mathcal{H}_{1,2}}. \tag{A.4}$$

Proof: Consider $d \in (-1,1)$ and $\nu > -1 + |d|$.

(i) We first introduce the transformations

$$r(y) \mapsto \bar{r}(\xi) = r(y)(1-y^2)^{\frac{1}{p-1}} \text{ and } r(y) \mapsto \hat{r}(\xi) = r(y)(1-y^2)^{\frac{1}{p-1}+\frac{1}{2}} \text{ with } y = \tanh\xi \tag{A.5}$$

and for $r = (r_1, r_2)$, the notation $\tilde{r} = (\bar{r}_1, \hat{r}_2)$. We then recall the following estimate from [17]:

Claim A.3 (Continuity of the transformation defined in (A.5) and its inverse) *There exists* $C_0 > 0$ *such that for all* $r \in \mathcal{H}$*, we have* $\frac{1}{C_0}\|r\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq \|\tilde{r}\|_{H^1\times L^2(\mathbb{R})} \leq C_0\|r\|_{\mathcal{H}}$*.*

Proof: See Claim B.2 in [17]. ■

Using the transformation (A.5) and definitions (1.13) and (1.14) of $\kappa(d,\cdot)$ and κ^*, we see that

$$\bar{\kappa}_1^*(d,\nu,\xi) = \lambda\bar{\kappa}_0(\xi - \zeta^*) \text{ and } \bar{\kappa}\left(\frac{d}{1+\nu}, \xi\right) = \bar{\kappa}_0(\xi - \zeta^*) \tag{A.6}$$

where

$$\bar{\kappa}_0(\xi) = \kappa_0 \cosh^{-\frac{2}{p-1}}\xi, \;\; \tanh\zeta^* = -\frac{d}{1+\nu} \tag{A.7}$$

and λ is defined in (3.23). Since $\|\bar{\kappa}_0\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \leq \kappa_0$, the first identity follows from (A.5). Since we have from the definition (1.14) of κ^*,

$$\kappa_2^*(d,\nu,y) = -\sqrt{\frac{2}{p+1}}\frac{\nu}{\sqrt{1-d^2}}\kappa_1^*(d,\nu,y)^{\frac{p+1}{2}},$$

it follows from (A.5) and (A.6) that

$$\widehat{\kappa_2^*}(d,\nu,\xi) = -\sqrt{\frac{2}{p+1}}\frac{\nu}{\sqrt{1-d^2}}\lambda^{\frac{p+1}{2}}\bar{\kappa}_0(\xi-\zeta^*)^{\frac{p+1}{2}}. \tag{A.8}$$

Therefore, we have from (A.6) and (A.8),

$$\|\bar\kappa_1^*(d,\nu,\cdot)\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})}\le C\lambda,\ \ \|\widehat{\kappa_2^*}(d,\nu,\cdot)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}\le C\frac{|\nu|}{\sqrt{1-d^2}}\lambda^{\frac{p+1}{2}} \tag{A.9}$$

$$\text{and}\qquad \left\|\bar\kappa_1^*(d,\nu,\cdot)-\bar\kappa\left(\frac{d}{1+\nu},\cdot\right)\right\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})}\le C|\lambda-1|. \tag{A.10}$$

Since we have from the definition (3.23) of λ and (A.9), if $\nu\ge 0$ then

$$\frac{\nu^2\lambda^{p-1}}{1-d^2}=\frac{\nu^2}{(1+\nu)^2-d^2}\le 1,\ \text{ hence } \|\widehat{\kappa_2^*}(d,\nu,\cdot)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}\le C\lambda,$$

the second and the third identities of (i) directly follow from (A.9) and (A.10) together with Claim A.3.

For the left-hand side of the forth identity, using the fact that for $\mu=\pm1$, $\kappa^*(d,\mu e^s,\cdot)$ is a particular solution of equation (1.9) which goes to $(\kappa(d,y),0)$ in $\mathcal{H}$ as $s\to-\infty$, we get the result from the monotonicity of E and (ii) of Claim A.1.

For the right-hand side of the forth identity, using the definition (1.12) of the Lyapunov functional $E(w)$ and integration by parts, we see that

$$E(\kappa^*)=\frac12\int_{-1}^1(\kappa_2^*)^2\rho+\frac12\int_{-1}^1\kappa_1^*\left(-\mathcal{L}\kappa_1^*+\frac{2(p+1)}{(p-1)^2}\kappa_1^*-\frac{2}{p+1}\kappa_1^{*p}\right)\rho.$$

Performing the change of variables (A.5) and using the fact that

$$\partial_\xi^2\bar\kappa_1^*-\frac{4}{(p-1)^2}\bar\kappa_1^*+\frac{2}{p+1}(\bar\kappa_1^*)^p=(1-y^2)^{\frac{p}{p-1}}\left[\mathcal{L}\kappa_1^*-\frac{2(p+1)}{(p-1)^2}\kappa_1^*+\frac{2}{p+1}\kappa_1^{*p}\right]$$

(see pages 59 and 60 in [15] for a proof of this fact), we see from the transformation (A.5) that

$$\begin{aligned}E(\kappa^*)&=\frac12\int_{\mathbb{R}}(\widehat{\kappa_2^*})^2+\frac12\int_{\mathbb{R}}\bar\kappa_1^*\left(-\partial_\xi^2\bar\kappa_1^*+\frac{4}{(p-1)^2}\bar\kappa_1^*-\frac{2}{p+1}(\bar\kappa_1^*)^p\right)\\&=\int_{\mathbb{R}}\left(\frac12(\widehat{\kappa_2^*})^2+\frac12(\partial_\xi\bar\kappa_1^*)^2+\frac{2}{(p-1)^2}(\bar\kappa_1^*)^2-\frac{1}{p+1}(\bar\kappa_1^*)^p\right)\end{aligned}$$

where $\widehat{\kappa_2^*}$ and $\bar\kappa_1^*$ are given in (A.8) and (A.6). Therefore,

$$E(\kappa^*(d,\nu,\cdot))=\beta_1\lambda^2-\beta_2\lambda^{p+1}+\beta_2\frac{\nu^2}{1-d^2}\lambda^{p+1}, \tag{A.11}$$

for some $\beta_1>0$ and

$$\beta_2=\frac{1}{p+1}\int_{\mathbb{R}}\bar\kappa_0(\xi)^{p+1}d\xi=\frac{1}{p+1}\kappa_0^{p+1}\int_{-1}^1\rho(y)dy \tag{A.12}$$

by the change of variables $y=\tanh\xi$. Since $\kappa^*(0,0,y)=(\kappa_0,0)$ and $\lambda=1$ when $d=\nu=0$, we see from (A.11) that

$$E(\kappa_0)=\beta_1-\beta_2. \tag{A.13}$$

Since

$$E(\kappa_0) = \left(\frac{(p+1)}{(p-1)^2}\kappa_0^2 - \frac{1}{p+1}\kappa_0^{p+1}\right)\int_{-1}^{1}\rho(y)dy = \frac{p-1}{2(p+1)}\kappa_0^{p+1}\int_{-1}^{1}\rho(y)dy$$

from the definitions (1.12) and (1.13) of $E(\kappa_0)$ and κ_0, we see from (A.12) and (A.13) that $\beta_2 = \frac{2}{p-1}E(\kappa_0)$ and $\beta_1 = \frac{p+1}{p-1}E(\kappa_0)$ and the result follows from (A.11). This concludes the proof of (i) of Lemma A.2.

(ii) Take $A \geq 2$ and assume that (A.2) holds. Introducing the following new variables

$$\zeta = -\operatorname{argth} d, \quad \mu = \frac{\nu}{1-|d|}, \quad \eta = \frac{\nu}{1-d^2}, \tag{A.14}$$

and for $i = 1$ and 2, $\zeta_i = \zeta(d_i, \nu_i)$, $\mu_i = \mu(d_i, \nu_i)$, $\eta_i = \eta(d_i, \nu_i)$ as well as $\lambda_i = \lambda(d_i, \nu_i)$ defined in (3.23), we see from (A.2) and (3.23) that for $i = 1$ and 2,

$$\mu_i, \eta_i \in [-1 + \frac{1}{A}, A], \quad \lambda_i \in [(1+A)^{-\frac{2}{p-1}}, A^{\frac{2}{p-1}}] \tag{A.15}$$

and

$$(\zeta, \mu) \mapsto (\zeta, \eta) \text{ is Lipschitz and so is its inverse.} \tag{A.16}$$

Due to this fact and to the fact that η is C^1 as a function of (d, ν), unlike μ, we will prove (A.3) and (A.4) with the variable η instead of μ.
We first prove the upper bound (A.3) then the lower bound (A.4).

The upper bound (A.3) on $\|\kappa^*(d_1, \nu_1) - \kappa^*(d_2, \nu_2)\|_{\mathcal{H}}$: From Claim A.3, (A.6), (A.8) and (A.15), we see that

$$\|\kappa^*(d_1,\nu_1) - \kappa^*(d_2,\nu_2)\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq C(A)\left(|\zeta_1^* - \zeta_2^*| + |\lambda_1 - \lambda_2| + \left|\frac{\nu_1}{\sqrt{1-d_1^2}} - \frac{\nu_2}{\sqrt{1-d_2^2}}\right|\right) \tag{A.17}$$

where for $i = 1$ and 2,

$$\zeta_i^* = -\operatorname{argth}\left(\frac{d_i}{1+\nu_i}\right). \tag{A.18}$$

Since $\frac{\nu}{\sqrt{1-d^2}} = \eta\sqrt{1-d^2} = \eta\cosh^{-1}\zeta$ from (A.14), we write from (A.15)

$$\left|\frac{\nu_1}{\sqrt{1-d_1^2}} - \frac{\nu_2}{\sqrt{1-d_2^2}}\right| \leq C(A)|\eta_1 - \eta_2| + C(A)|\zeta_1 - \zeta_2|. \tag{A.19}$$

Therefore, clearly the upper bound follows from (A.17), (A.19) and (A.14), if we prove that under (A.15)

$$\|\operatorname*{Jac}_{\zeta,\eta}(\zeta^*, \lambda)\| \leq C(A). \tag{A.20}$$

It remains then to prove (A.20).
From the definitions (A.18) and (3.23) of ζ^* and λ, we write

$$\operatorname*{Jac}_{d,\nu}(\zeta^*, \lambda) = \frac{1}{(1+\nu)^2 - d^2}\begin{pmatrix} -(1+\nu) & d \\ \frac{2d\lambda^{2-p}(1-(1+\nu)^2)}{(p-1)[(1+\nu)^2-d^2]} & -\frac{2(1+\nu)\lambda^{2-p}(1-d^2)}{(p-1)[(1+\nu)^2-d^2]} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{A.21}$$

Using (2.20) and (A.15), we see that

$$\| \underset{d,\nu}{\mathrm{Jac}}(\zeta^*,\lambda)\| \le \frac{C(A)}{1-d^2} \text{ and } \| \underset{\zeta,\eta}{\mathrm{Jac}}(d,\nu)\| \le C(A)(1-d^2). \tag{A.22}$$

By multiplication, we get (A.20). This concludes the proof of the upper bound in (ii).

The lower bound (A.4) on $\|\kappa^*(d_1,\nu_1)-\kappa^*(d_2,\nu_2)\|_{\mathcal{H}}$: Using the transformation (A.5) and the embedding of $H^1(\xi > A)$ into $L^\infty(\xi > A)$, the notation (A.14), (A.18) and symmetry, we see that it is enough to prove that for some $\epsilon_0(A) > 0$, if for some $\zeta_1^* < 0$, λ_1 and λ_2 satisfying (A.15), we have

$$E \equiv \|\lambda_1\bar\kappa_0(\cdot-\zeta_1^*) - \lambda_2\bar\kappa_0\|_{L^\infty(\xi>A)} \le \epsilon_0(A), \tag{A.23}$$

then

$$|\zeta_1^*| + |\lambda_1-\lambda_2| \le C(A)E \text{ and } \| \underset{\zeta,\eta}{\mathrm{Jac}}(\zeta^*,\lambda)^{-1}\| \le C(A). \tag{A.24}$$

Taking $\xi = A-\zeta_1^* \ge A$ then $\xi = A$ in (A.23), we write

$$|\lambda_1\cosh^{-\frac{2}{p-1}}(A-2\zeta_1^*) - \lambda_2\cosh^{-\frac{2}{p-1}}(A-\zeta_1^*)| + |\lambda_1\cosh^{-\frac{2}{p-1}}(A-\zeta_1^*) - \lambda_2\cosh^{-\frac{2}{p-1}}A| \le \frac{E}{\kappa_0}. \tag{A.25}$$

Using (A.15), we see that

$$|\zeta_1^*| \le C(A) \text{ and } |\cosh^{-\frac{2}{p-1}}(A-2\zeta_1^*)\cosh^{-\frac{2}{p-1}}A - \cosh^{-\frac{4}{p-1}}(A-\zeta_1^*)| \le C(A)E,$$

hence

$$C(A)E \ge |\cosh(A-2\zeta_1^*)\cosh A - \cosh^2(A-\zeta_1^*)| = \frac{1}{2}|1-\cosh(2\zeta_1^*)|,$$

and the first estimate of (A.24) follows from (A.25), provided that ϵ_0 is small enough. Now, we prove the second estimate of (A.24). Since we know that $\|\mathrm{Jac}_{\zeta,\eta}(d,\nu)^{-1}\| \le \frac{C(A)}{1-d^2}$ from (2.23), it is enough to prove that under (A.15), we have

$$\| \underset{d,\nu}{\mathrm{Jac}}(\zeta^*,\lambda)^{-1}\| \le C(A)(1-d^2) \tag{A.26}$$

From (A.21), we see that

$$\underset{d,\nu}{\mathrm{Jac}}(\zeta^*,\lambda)^{-1} = -\begin{pmatrix} (1+\nu)(1-d^2) & \frac{d\lambda^{p-2}(p-1)}{2}\left[(1+\nu)^2-d^2\right] \\ d(1-(1+\nu)^2) & \frac{(1+\nu)\lambda^{p-2}(p-1)}{2}\left[(1+\nu)^2-d^2\right] \end{pmatrix}$$

Using (A.15) and the definitions (A.14) and (3.23) of μ_i, η_i and λ_i, we see that (A.26) follows, and so does the second estimate of (A.24). This concludes the proof of Lemma A.2. ■

B Technical computations on the solitons

This Appendix is devoted to the proofs of Claims 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.7 and (i) of Claim 3.9.

Proof of Claim 3.3: From the transformation (3.18), Claim 3.3 is a direct consequence of the following:

Claim B.1 (Transformation of the error terms)
(i) It holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
r_1(y,s) &= (1-(1-b)xe^s)^{-\frac{2}{p-1}} R_1(Y,S), && \text{(B.1)}\\
\partial_y r_1(y,s) &= (1-(1-b)xe^s)^{-\frac{p+1}{p-1}} \partial_Y R_1(Y,S), && \text{(B.2)}\\
r_2(y,s) &= (1-(1-b)xe^s)^{-\frac{p+1}{p-1}} \left[R_2(Y,S) + \frac{2(1-b)xe^s}{p-1} R_1(Y,S)\right.\\
&\quad \left. + \frac{xe^s(1+y(1-b))}{1-(1-b)xe^s} \partial_Y R_1(Y,S)\right] && \text{(B.3)}
\end{aligned}$$

where (Y,S) and (y,s) are linked by (3.18).
(ii) For all $m \in [\hat{k}, k]$, $L_m > 0$ large enough and $|x|$ small enough with $x<0$, for all $s \in [s_{m+1}, s_m]$ and $y \in [y_1(s), 1]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
-e^{L_m} &\le (1-b)xe^s \le 0, & \frac{1}{1+e^{L_m}} &\le (1-(1-b)xe^s)^{-1} \le 1,\\
1-y &\le (1+e^{L_m})(1-Y), & 1+y &\le 2(1+e^{L_m})(1+Y),\\
\tfrac{|x|e^s(1+y(1-b))}{1-(1-b)xe^s} &\le (1+2e^{L_m})(1-Y^2).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, the proof reduces to the proof of Claim B.1.

Proof of Claim B.1:
(i)- *Proof of (B.1)*: It follows directly from (3.19) and (3.20) thanks to the linear character of $\mathcal{T}$ and the definitions (3.21), (3.22) and (3.9) of R_1, r_1, $\bar{\nu}_i$ and $\bar{d}_i$.
- *Proof of (B.2)*: It follows from the differentiation of (B.1).
Proof of (B.3): Differentiating (3.19) and (3.20) with respect to s, we get from the definition (1.14) of κ^*

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_s w_x(y,s) &= (1-(1-b)xe^s)^{-\frac{p+1}{p-1}} \left[\partial_S W(Y,S) + \tfrac{2(1-b)xe^s}{p-1} W(Y,S)\right.\\
&\quad \left. + \tfrac{xe^s(1+y(1-b))}{1-(1-b)xe^s} \partial_Y W(Y,S)\right]\\
\kappa_2^*(d,\nu,y) &= (1-(1-b)xe^s)^{-\frac{p+1}{p-1}} \left[\tfrac{2(1-b)xe^s}{p-1} \kappa(d,Y) + \tfrac{xe^s(1+y(1-b))}{1-(1-b)xe^s} \partial_y \kappa(d,Y)\right]
\end{aligned}$$

where d is arbitrary in $(-1,1)$ and $\nu = [b-(1-d)]xe^s$. Using the definitions (3.21) and (3.22) of R and r, we get the conclusion of (i).

(ii) Consider $m \in [\hat{k}, k]$, $L_m > 0$ and $s \in [s_{m+1}, s_m]$. Since we have from the definition (3.7)-(3.8) of s_m,

$$s_m \le l + L_m, \text{ hence } |x|e^{s_m} \le e^{L_m},$$

we write from (3.5) for $|x|$ small enough,

$$0 < -(1-b)xe^s \le |x|e^s \le |x|e^{s_m} \le e^{L_m},$$

which yields the first and the second inequality.
Using (3.18), (3.5) and the second inequality, we write for $|x|$ small enough,

$$1 - Y = \frac{1 - y - (2-b)xe^s}{1-(1-b)xe^s} \ge \frac{1-y}{1+e^{L_m}},$$

and the third inequality follows.
Using again (3.18), we write

$$1 + Y = \frac{1 + y + bxe^s}{1-(1-b)xe^s}. \tag{B.4}$$

Since we have by definition (3.17) of $y_1(s)$,

$$\text{if } y \ge y_1(s), \text{ then } |bxe^s| = \frac{1}{2}(1 + y_1(s)) \le \frac{1}{2}(1+y),$$

it follows from (B.4) and the second inequality that

$$1 + Y \ge \frac{1+y}{2(1+e^{L_m})},$$

and the forth inequality follows.
Since $y \in (y_1(s), 1)$, it follows from (3.18), (3.5), the first and the second inequality that $Y \in (Y_1, Y_2)$ with

$$Y_1 = \frac{-1 + xe^s(1-2b)}{1-(1-b)xe^s} \text{ and } Y_2 = \frac{1+xe^s}{1-(1-b)xe^s},$$

hence

$$1 - Y > 1 - Y_2 = \frac{(2-b)|x|e^s}{1-(1-b)xe^s} \ge \frac{|x|e^s}{1+e^{L_m}}, \tag{B.5}$$

$$\frac{1+Y}{1+(1-b)Y} > \frac{1+Y_1}{1+(1-b)Y_1} = \frac{|x|e^s}{1-2(1-b)xe^s} \ge \frac{|x|e^s}{1+2e^{L_m}} \tag{B.6}$$

Since we have from (3.18),

$$\frac{|x|e^s(1+y(1-b))}{1-(1-b)xe^s} = |x|e^s(1+Y(1-b)),$$

using (B.5) and (B.6) we get the fifth inequality. This concludes the proof of Claim B.1 and Claim 3.3 too. ■

Now, we prove Claim 3.4.

Proof of Claim 3.4: Note first from (3.3) that when $1 \le i < \frac{k+1}{2} < j \le k$ and $S \ge S_0$ is large enough, we have

$$\frac{S^{-\gamma_i}}{C_0} \le 1 - D_i(S) \le C_0 S^{-\gamma_i}, \quad |D_{\frac{k+1}{2}}(S)| \le 1 - \frac{1}{C_0} \text{ and } \frac{S^{\gamma_j}}{C_0} \le 1 + D_j(S) \le C_0 S^{\gamma_j} \tag{B.7}$$

(of course, the middle estimate holds only when $\frac{k+1}{2} \in \mathbb{N}$).
Now, consider $L_{k+1} > 0$,...,$L_{\hat{k}} > 0$, $x < 0$ and $m \in [\hat{k}, k]$. Using the definition (3.11) of S_m, we see from the definitions (3.6), (3.7) and (3.8) that when $|x| \to 0$, we have

$$\begin{array}{rcl} S_{k+1} &=& L_{k+1} + O(x), \\ S_m &=& l + \gamma_m \log l + L_m + O(l^{\gamma_m}) \text{ if } \hat{k}+1 \le m \le k, \\ S_{\hat{k}} \le S(l + L_{\hat{k}}) &=& l - \log(1 + e^{-L_{\hat{k}}}) + O(l^{-\gamma_1}). \end{array} \tag{B.8}$$

Take first $i \ge \hat{k}+1$ and $s \in [s_i, l + L_{\hat{k}}]$. Using (B.8), (B.7), the bound (3.5) on b and the definition (3.9) of $\bar{\nu}_i$, we see that as $x \to 0$,

$$\frac{l}{2} \le S(s) \le 2l, \;\; \frac{l^{\gamma_i}}{C} \le 1 + \bar{d}_i(s) \le C l^{\gamma_i} \text{ and } \bar{\nu}_i(s) \ge \frac{e^{L_i} l^{\gamma_i}}{C} > 0. \tag{B.9}$$

Recalling from the definition (3.23) of λ that

$$\lambda(d,\nu)^{1-p} = \left(1 + \frac{\nu}{1-d}\right)\left(1 + \frac{\nu}{1+d}\right), \tag{B.10}$$

we see from (B.9) that $\lambda(\bar{d}_i(s_i), \bar{\nu}_i(s_i))^{1-p} \ge \frac{e^{L_i}}{C}$ and the conclusion follows from (i) of Lemma A.2.
Now, if $i = 2, ..., \hat{k}$ and $s = l + L_{\hat{k}}$, then using (B.8), (3.5) and (B.7), we see that

$$2b \le \frac{C}{l^{\gamma_1}} \le 1 - \bar{d}_i(l + L_{\hat{k}}), \text{ hence } \bar{\nu}_i(l + L_{\hat{k}}) \ge \frac{(1 - \bar{d}_i(l + L_{\hat{k}}))e^{L_{\hat{k}}}}{2} > 0$$

from the definition (3.9) of $\bar{\nu}_i$. Using (B.10), we see that $\lambda(\bar{d}_i(l+L), \bar{\nu}_i(l+L))^{1-p} \ge \frac{e^{L_{\hat{k}}}}{C}$, and the conclusion follows again from (i) of Lemma A.2. This concludes the proof of Claim 3.4. ■

Now, we prove Claim 3.5.

Proof of Claim 3.5: Consider $m \in [\hat{k}, k]$, $L_m > 0$, $L_{m+1} > 0$, $x < 0$, and $s \in [s_{m+1}, s_m]$. Using (B.8), we see that for $|x|$ small enough, we have

$$\begin{array}{rcccll} L_{m+1} &\le& s &\le& l + \min(\gamma_m, 0)\log l + L_m, & \\ L_{m+1} - 1 &\le& S(s) &\le& l + 1 & \text{and for } m \le k-1, \;\; |S - l| \le 1. \end{array} \tag{B.11}$$

We first prove (3.24) then (3.25).

Proof of (3.24): Consider $i = 1, ..., m$. Using the definition (3.9) of $\bar{d}_i$ and $\bar{\nu}_i$, (B.7), (B.11) and the bound (3.5) on b, we write for L_{m+1} large enough and $|x|$ small enough:
- If $\frac{k+1}{2} < i \le m$, then $\bar{d}_i(s) < 0$ and $\gamma_m < 0$ by definition (3.3). Therefore,

$$0 \le \frac{\bar{\nu}_i(s)}{1 - |\bar{d}_i(s)|} = \frac{|x|e^s}{1 + \bar{d}_i(s)}[1 - \bar{d}_i(s) - b] \le \frac{2|x|e^s}{1 + D_m(S)} \le 2C_0 S^{-\gamma_m}|x|e^s \le 3C_0 e^{L_m} \tag{B.12}$$

and (3.24) follows.
- If $i = \frac{k+1}{2}$, then

$$0 \le \frac{\bar{\nu}_i(s)}{1 - |\bar{d}_i(s)|} \le C|x|e^s \le Ce^{L_m} \tag{B.13}$$

and (3.24) follows in this case.
- If $i < \frac{k+1}{2}$, then

$$\bar{d}_i(s) > 0 \text{ and } \frac{\bar{\nu}_i(s)}{1-|\bar{d}_i(s)|} = |x|e^s\left[1 - \frac{b}{1-D_i(S)}\right] \le |x|e^s \le e^{L_m} \tag{B.14}$$

and

$$\frac{b}{1-D_i(S)} \le C_0^2 l^{\gamma_i-\gamma_1}. \tag{B.15}$$

If $2 \le i < \frac{k+1}{2}$, then it follows by definition (3.3) of γ_i that $\frac{b}{1-D_i(S)} \le \frac{1}{2}$ for $|x|$ small enough. Using (B.14), we see that

$$\frac{\bar{\nu}_i(s)}{1-|\bar{d}_i(s)|} \ge 0 \text{ when } 2 \le i < \frac{k+1}{2} \tag{B.16}$$

and (3.24) follows from (B.14) and (B.16).
If $i = 1$ and $m = \hat{k}$, recalling that $s \le s_{\hat{k}}$ for $|x|$ small enough, we see by definition (3.8) of $s_{\hat{k}}$ and (B.14) that

$$\frac{\bar{\nu}_1(s)}{1-|\bar{d}_1(s)|} = \frac{\bar{\nu}_1(s)}{1-\bar{d}_1(s)} \ge -1 + e^{-(p-1)L_{\hat{k}}} \tag{B.17}$$

and (3.24) follows from (B.14) and (B.17).
If $i = 1$ and $m \in [\hat{k}+1, k]$, then we see from (B.14) and the definitions (3.7) and (3.3) of s_m and γ_m that

$$\frac{\bar{\nu}_1(s)}{1-|\bar{d}_1(s)|} \le |x|e^s \le |x|e^{s_m} = l^{\gamma_m}e^{L_m} \le l^{-\frac{(p-1)}{2}}e^{L_m} \to 0 \text{ as } x \to 0. \tag{B.18}$$

Therefore, (3.24) follows in this case too.
This concludes the proof of (3.24).

Proof of (3.25): Using the definition (3.26) of $\bar{\zeta}_i^*(s)$, we write for $i = 1, ..., m$,

$$\bar{\zeta}_i^*(s) = -\operatorname{argth}\left(\frac{\bar{d}_i(s)}{1+\bar{\nu}_i(s)}\right) = \frac{1}{2}\log\left[\frac{1-\bar{d}_i(s)+\bar{\nu}_i(s)}{1+\bar{d}_i(s)+\bar{\nu}_i(s)}\right] \tag{B.19}$$

$$= \frac{1}{2}\log\left(\frac{1-\bar{d}_i(s)}{1+\bar{d}_i(s)}\right) + \frac{1}{2}\log\left(1+\frac{\bar{\nu}_i(s)}{1-\bar{d}_i(s)}\right) - \frac{1}{2}\log\left(1+\frac{\bar{\nu}_i(s)}{1+\bar{d}_i(s)}\right). \tag{B.20}$$

Since the two last terms are bounded by CL_m from (3.24), and $\bar{d}_i(s) = D_i(S(s))$ by (3.9), we write from (3.3)

$$\left|\bar{\zeta}_i^*(s) + \frac{\gamma_i}{2}\log S(s)\right| \le C^*L_m \text{ where } \gamma_i = (p-1)\left(\frac{k+1}{2} - i\right)$$

for some $C^* > 0$.
If $\frac{(p-1)}{2}\log S(s) \ge 3C^*L_m$, then for all $i = 1, ..., m-1$, $\bar{\zeta}_{i+1}^*(s) - \bar{\zeta}_i^*(s) \ge \frac{(p-1)}{6}\log S(s) \ge \frac{(p-1)}{6}\log(L_{m+1}-1)$ by (B.11) and (3.25) follows by taking L_{m+1} large enough.
If $\frac{(p-1)}{2}\log S(s) < 3C^*L_m$, then for $|x|$ small enough, we have

$$L_{m+1} - 1 \le S(s) \le e^{\frac{6C^*}{p-1}L_m} \text{ and } L_{m+1} \le s \le C(L_m) \tag{B.21}$$

for some $C(L_m) > 0$, where we used (B.11) and the expression (3.10) of $S(s)$. Using (B.12), (B.13) and (B.14), we see that

$$\frac{\bar\nu_i(s)}{1-|\bar d_i(s)|} \le C(L_m)|x| \le \frac{1}{10}$$

for $|x|$ small enough. Recalling from (B.12), (B.13) and (B.16) that

$$\bar\nu_i(s) \ge 0 \text{ when } i \ge 2, \tag{B.22}$$

we derive from (B.20), (3.9) and (3.3):

$$\text{for } 2 \le i \le m,\quad \left|\bar\zeta_i^*(s) + \frac{\gamma_i}{2}\log S(s)\right| \le C \text{ where } \gamma_i = (p-1)\left(\frac{k+1}{2} - i\right). \tag{B.23}$$

If $i = 1$ and $\bar\nu_1(s) \ge 0$, then (B.23) holds for $i = 1$ by the same argument as for $i \ge 2$.
If $i = 1$ and $\bar\nu_1(s) < 0$, then, recalling from (B.14) that $\bar d_1(s) > 0$, we see by the expression (B.19) of $\bar\zeta_1^*(s)$, (3.9) and (3.3) that

$$\bar\zeta_1^*(s) \le -\operatorname{argth}(\bar d_1(s)) \le -\frac{\gamma_1}{2}\log S(s) + C. \tag{B.24}$$

Using (B.23), the line after (B.23), (B.24) and (B.21), we see that for $|x|$ small enough, for all $i = 1, ..., m-1$,

$$\bar\zeta_{i+1}^*(s) - \bar\zeta_i^*(s) \ge \frac{(p-1)}{2}\log S(s) - C \ge \frac{(p-1)}{2}\log(L_{m+1}-1) - C,$$

and estimate (3.25) follows when $\frac{(p-1)}{2}\log S(s) < 3C^* L_m$, provided that L_{m+1} is large enough. This concludes the proof of (3.25) and Claim 3.5 as well. ■

Now, we prove Claim 3.7.

Proof of Claim 3.7: From the upper bound in (ii) of Lemma A.2, Claim 3.5 and (3.35), we clearly see that (ii) follows from (i) and estimate (3.33). Thus, we only prove (i). In fact, we will bound only the two first terms in (i) since the third is bounded by their sum thanks to (A.16) and (A.20). Take $s \in [s_{m+1}, \bar s]$. Using (3.14), Lemma 3.2, Claims 3.4 and 3.5, and (3.34), we see that

$$\left\|\sum_{i=1}^m (-1)^i \left(\kappa^*(d_i(s),\nu_i(s)) - \kappa^*(\bar d_i(s),\bar\nu_i(s))\right)\right\|_{\mathcal{H}(y>y_1(s))} \le 2\epsilon \tag{B.25}$$

where $y_1(s)$ is given in (3.17) and for all $i = 1, ..., m-1$,

$$\bar\zeta_{i+1}^*(s) - \bar\zeta_i^*(s) \ge \frac{(p-1)}{7}\log L_{m+1} \text{ and } \zeta_{i+1}^*(s) - \zeta_i^*(s) \ge \frac{(p-1)}{9}\log L_{m+1} \tag{B.26}$$

if L_{m+1} is large enough and $|x|$ is small enough. Note first that for L_m large enough and $|x|$ small enough, we have

$$\forall i = 1, ..., m,\quad \operatorname{argth} y_1(s) \le -\operatorname{argth}\left(\frac{\bar d_i(s)}{1+\bar\nu_i(s)}\right) + pL_m \tag{B.27}$$

(see below for a proof of this fact).

Using (B.27), we see that (B.25) yields by truncation

$$\|\kappa^*(d_m(s),\nu_m(s))-\kappa^*(\bar d_m(s),\bar\nu_m(s))\|_{\mathcal{H}(y>\tanh(\operatorname{argth}(\max(-\frac{\bar d_m(s)}{1+\bar\nu_m(s)},-\frac{d_m(s)}{1+\nu_m(s)}))+pL_m))}\le 2\epsilon. \tag{B.28}$$

From Claim 3.5 and (3.35), we see that the lower bound in (ii) of Lemma A.2 applies provided that $\epsilon\le\epsilon_0(L_m)$ for some $\epsilon_0(L_m)$, and we get the conclusion for $i=m$.
Using now the upper bound in (ii) of Lemma A.2, we see that (B.28) actually holds in $\mathcal{H}$, in the sense that

$$\|\kappa^*(d_m(s),\nu_m(s))-\kappa^*(\bar d_m(s),\bar\nu_m(s))\|_{\mathcal{H}}\le C(L_m)\epsilon.$$

Using this, we see that (B.25) now holds with a sum running from $i=1$ up to $i=m-1$. Iterating the above argument by induction for i decreasing from m to 1, one can easily conclude the proof of of (i) in Claim 3.7. It remains to prove (B.27) in order to conclude.

Proof of (B.27): From (B.26) and the definition (3.26) of $\bar\zeta_i^*(s)$, it is enough to prove this for $i=1$. Using (B.11) and (B.7), we see that

$$S\le l+1 \text{ and } \frac{l^{-\gamma_1}}{C}\le 1-\bar d_1(s) \tag{B.29}$$

for L_{m+1} large enough and $|x|$ small enough.
- **Case** $\hat k+1\le m\le k$: Using the definition (3.9) of $\bar\nu_i(s)$ and (B.29), we see that

$$-\frac{\bar d_1(s)}{1+\bar\nu_1(s)}=-\frac{\bar d_1(s)}{1+[b-(1-\bar d_1(s))xe^s]}\ge-\frac{1-\frac{l^{-\gamma_1}}{C}}{1+[b-\frac{l^{-\gamma_1}}{C}]xe^s}. \tag{B.30}$$

Since $s\le s_m$, we see from the bound (3.5) on b and the definition (3.7) of s_m that $\left|[b-\frac{l^{-\gamma_1}}{C}]xe^s\right|\le Cl^{-\gamma_1}l^{-\frac{(p-1)}{2}}e^{L_m}$. Using (B.30), we write for $|x|$ small enough,

$$-\frac{\bar d_1(s)}{1+\bar\nu_1(s)}\ge-1+\frac{l^{-\gamma_1}}{C},\text{ hence }-\operatorname{argth}\left(\frac{\bar d_1(s)}{1+\bar\nu_1(s)}\right)\ge-\frac{\gamma_1}{2}\log l-C. \tag{B.31}$$

Using the definition (3.17) and (3.7) of $y_1(s)$ and s_m together with (3.3), we write

$$y_1(s)=-1+2b|x|e^s\le-1+Cl^{-\gamma_1}l^{-\frac{(p-1)}{2}}e^{L_m},$$

hence

$$\operatorname{argth}y_1(s)\le-\left(\frac{\gamma_1}{2}+\frac{p-1}{4}\right)\log l+\frac{L_m}{2}+C. \tag{B.32}$$

Thus, (B.27) follows from (B.31) and (B.32) for $|x|$ small enough, in the case where $\hat k+1\le m\le k$.
- **Case** $m=k$: Since $s\le s_{\hat k}$, we see from the definition (3.8) of $s_{\hat k}$ that

$$-\frac{\bar d_1(s)}{1+\bar\nu_1(s)}\ge-\frac{\bar d_1(s)}{\bar d_1(s)+e^{-(p-1)L_m}(1-\bar d_1(s))}\ge-1+\frac{e^{-(p-1)L_m}C^{-\gamma_1}}{l},$$

hence

$$-\operatorname{argth}\left(\frac{\bar{d}_1(s)}{1+\bar{\nu}_1(s)}\right) \geq -\frac{\gamma_1}{2}\log l - \frac{(p-1)}{2}L_{\hat{k}} - C. \tag{B.33}$$

Using (3.5), the definitions (3.7), (3.3) and (3.17) of s_m, γ_i and $y_1(s)$, we see that

$$y_1(s) = -1 - 2bxe^s \leq -1 + Cl^{-\gamma_1}e^{L_{\hat{k}}} \text{ hence } \operatorname{argth} y_1(s) \leq -\frac{\gamma_1}{2}\log l + \frac{L_{\hat{k}}}{2} + C. \tag{B.34}$$

Thus, from (B.33) and (B.34), we see that (B.27) holds for L_m large enough. This concludes the proof of (B.27) and (i) of Claim 3.7 too. Since (ii) of Claim 3.7 follows from (i) as we said in the beginning of the proof, this concludes the proof of Claim 3.7. ■

Now, we prove (i) of Claim 3.9.

Proof of (i) of Claim 3.9: Consider $M_0 > 0$, $x < 0$ and $s \in [s_{m+1}, s_m - M_0]$. From (3.35), (2.22) (applied with $A = CL_m$) and Claim 3.7, we see that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m}\frac{|\nu_i(s)|}{1-|d_i^*(s)|} \leq C(L_m)\sum_{i=1}^{m}\frac{|\nu_i(s)|}{1-|d_i(s)|} \leq C(L_m)\sum_{i=1}^{m}\frac{|\bar{\nu}_i(s)|}{1-\bar{d}_i(s)^2} + C(L_m)\epsilon.$$

Taking ϵ small enough so that $C(L_m)\epsilon \leq \frac{\eta_0}{2}$, it is enough to show that for all $i = 1, ..., m$,

$$\frac{|\bar{\nu}_i(s)|}{1-\bar{d}_i(s)^2} \leq \frac{\eta_0}{2kC(L_m)}. \tag{B.35}$$

Note first from the definitions (3.6)-(3.8) of s_{m+1} and s_m that for $|x|$ small enough,

$$L_{m+1} \leq s \leq l + L_m - M_0. \tag{B.36}$$

Using the definition (3.10) of $S = S(s)$, we see that if $M_0 \geq L_m$ and $|x|$ is small enough, then

$$L_{m+1} - 1 \leq S \leq l + 2. \tag{B.37}$$

From the definition (3.9) of $\bar{\nu}_i$ and $\bar{d}_i$, we write

$$\frac{\bar{\nu}_i(s)}{1-\bar{d}_i(s)^2} = \frac{|x|e^s}{1+D_i(S)}\left(1 - \frac{b}{1-D_i(S)}\right). \tag{B.38}$$

Using (B.37), (B.7), the bound (3.5) on b and the definitions (3.6)-(3.8) of s_m, we write

$$\frac{|\bar{\nu}_i(s)|}{1-\bar{d}_i(s)^2} \leq \frac{C|x|e^s}{1+D_i(S)} \leq \frac{C|x|e^s}{1+D_m(S)} \leq C_0 e^{L_m - M_0}$$

and (B.35) follows if $M_0 = M_0(L_m)$ is large enough.
This concludes the proof of (i) of Claim 3.9. ■

C Analysis of the linearization of equation (1.9) around a sum of $\kappa^*(d_i,\nu_i)$

This Appendix is devoted to the study of the dynamics of equation (1.9) near a decoupled sum of $\pm\kappa^*(d_i,\nu_i)$ and to the proof of Claim 3.8. This is in fact a generalization of the case where all $\nu_i=0$ already treated in Appendix C in [17], and of the case of one soliton with $\nu_i=0$ treated in Section 5 page 99 in [15].

We have 3 steps in the following:
- In Section C.1, we give the equation satisfied by the error term q defined in (3.36) when we make the linearization. We also give a decomposition of the error term, well-adapted to the spectrum of the linearization.
- In Section C.2, we project the equation on the various modes and prove Claim 3.8.
- Finally, we give in Section C.3 a table for some integrals appearing in the proof.

C.1 An equation satisfied by q

Using the fact that when $\nu=\mu e^s$, the function $(y,s)\mapsto\kappa^*(d,\mu e^s,y)$ is a particular solution of equation (1.9), we see from equation (1.9) and the change of variables (3.36) that q defined in (3.36) satisfies the following equation for all $s\in[s_{m+1},\bar{s}]$:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial}{\partial s}\begin{pmatrix}q_1\\ q_2\end{pmatrix} &= \hat{L}\begin{pmatrix}q_1\\ q_2\end{pmatrix}-\sum_{j=1}^{m}(-1)^j\left[(\nu_j'(s)-\nu_j(s))\partial_\nu\kappa^*+d_j'(s)\partial_d\kappa^*\right](d_j(s),\nu_j(s),y)\\ &+\begin{pmatrix}0\\ R\end{pmatrix}+\begin{pmatrix}0\\ f(q_1)\end{pmatrix}\end{aligned}\tag{C.1}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{L}\begin{pmatrix}q_1\\ q_2\end{pmatrix} &= \begin{pmatrix}q_2\\ \mathcal{L}q_1+\psi q_1-\frac{p+3}{p-1}q_2-2y\partial_y q_2\end{pmatrix}, &(C.2)\\ \psi(y,s) &= p|K_1^*(y,s)|^{p-1}-\frac{2(p+1)}{(p-1)^2},\quad K_1^*(y,s)=\sum_{j=1}^{m}(-1)^i\kappa_1^*(d_j(s),\nu_j(s),y)&(C.3)\\ f(q_1) &= |K_1^*+q_1|^{p-1}(K_1^*+q_1)-|K_1^*|^{p-1}K_1^*-p|K_1^*|^{p-1}q_1,\\ R &= |K_1^*|^{p-1}K_1^*-\sum_{j=1}^{m}(-1)^j\kappa_1^*(d_j(s),\nu_j(s),y)^p.\end{aligned}$$

Let us remark that equation (C.1) can be localized near the center $d_i^*(s)$ of $\kappa^*(d_i(s),\mu_i(s))$ (which is the same as the center of $\kappa\left(\frac{d_i(s)}{1+\nu_i(s)}\right)$ by (i) of Lemma A.2) for each $i=1,...,m$, which allows us to view it locally as a perturbation of the case of $\kappa(d,y)$ already treated in [15]. For this, given $i=1,...,m$, we need to expand the linear operator of equation (C.1) as

$$\hat{L}(q)=\hat{L}_{d_i^*(s)}(q)+(0,\bar{V}_i(y,s)q_1)+(0,V_i^*(y,s)q_1)\tag{C.4}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{L}_d \begin{pmatrix} q_1 \\ q_2 \end{pmatrix} &= \begin{pmatrix} q_2 \\ \mathcal{L}q_1 + \psi^*(d)q_1 - \frac{p+3}{p-1}q_2 - 2yq_2' \end{pmatrix}, && \text{(C.5)}\\
\psi^*(d,y) &= p\kappa(d,y)^{p-1} - \frac{2(p+1)}{(p-1)^2}, && \text{(C.6)}\\
\bar{V}_i(y,s) &= p\kappa^*(d_i(s),\nu_i(s),y)^{p-1} - p\kappa(d_i^*(s),y)^{p-1}, && \text{(C.7)}\\
V_i^*(y,s) &= p|K_1^*(y,s)|^{p-1} - p\kappa^*(d_i(s),\nu_i(s),y)^{p-1}. && \text{(C.8)}
\end{aligned}$$

Since we will work in the regime where the solitons' sum is decoupled (see the estimate (3.34)), the properties of $\hat{L}_{d_i(s)}$ will be essential in our analysis.
From section 4 in [15], we know that for any $d \in (-1,1)$, the operator $\hat{L}_d$ has 1 and 0 as eigenvalues, the rest of the eigenvalues are negative. More precisely, we have for $l = 0$ and 1,

$$\hat{L}_d(F_l(d)) = lF_l(d) \text{ and } \|F_1(d)\|_{\mathcal{H}} + \|F_0(d)\|_{\mathcal{H}} \le C \tag{C.9}$$

where $F_l(d)$ is defined in (2.13). The projection on $F_l(d)$ is defined in (2.1) by $\pi_l^d(r) = \phi(W_l(d), r)$ where $W_l(d)$ is defined in (2.3) and (2.4). Of course,

$$\hat{L}_d^* W_l(d) = lW_l(d) \tag{C.10}$$

where $\hat{L}_d^*$ is the conjugate of $\hat{L}_d$ with respect to the inner product ϕ defined in (2.2). We also recall from (2.12) the following orthogonality condition

$$\pi_l^d(F_{l'}(d)) = \phi(W_l(d), F_{l'}(d)) = \delta_{l,l'}. \tag{C.11}$$

In the following, we give a decomposition of the solution which is well adapted to the proof:

Lemma C.1 (Decomposition of q) *If we introduce for all r and $\mathbf{r}$ in $\mathcal{H}$ the operator $\pi_-(r) \equiv r_-(y,s)$ defined by*

$$r(y,s) = \sum_{i=1}^{k}\sum_{l=0}^{1} \pi_l^{d_i^*(s)}(r)F(d_i^*(s),y) + \pi_-(r), \tag{C.12}$$

and

$$\varphi(r,\mathbf{r}) = \int_{-1}^{1} \left(r_1'\mathbf{r}_1'(1-y^2) - \psi r_1\mathbf{r}_1 + r_2\mathbf{r}_2\right)\rho dy, \tag{C.13}$$

then the following holds for all $L_{m+1} \ge L_{m+1,5}(L_m)$ and $|x| \le a_5(L_m, L_{m+1})$ for some $L_{m+1,5}$ and $a_5 > 0$:
(i) For all $s \in [s_{m+1}, \bar{s}]$ and for all r and $\mathbf{r}$ in $\mathcal{H}$, we have

$$|\varphi(r,\mathbf{r})| \le C(L_m)\|r\|_{\mathcal{H}}\|\mathbf{r}\|_{\mathcal{H}} \text{ and } q(y,s) = q_-(y,s).$$

(ii) There exists $\eta_0 > 0$ such that for all $s \in [s_{m+1}, \bar{s}]$, if (3.38) holds, then

$$\frac{1}{C_0}\|q(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \le A_-(s) \le C(L_m)\|q(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \text{ where } A_-(s) = \varphi(q(s),q(s)). \tag{C.14}$$

Remark: The operator π_- depends on the time variable s. The constants $C_0 > 0$ and $\eta_0 > 0$ are universal.
Proof: Using (3.35), we easily see that

$$\frac{e^{-\frac{2L_m}{p-1}}}{C} \le \lambda_i(s) \le Ce^{2L_m} \text{ and } -1 + \frac{e^{-(p-1)L_m}}{2} \le \nu_i \le 1 + C_0 e^{L_m}, \tag{C.15}$$

where $\lambda_i(s) = \lambda(d_i(s), \nu_i(s))$ is defined in (3.23), hence

$$\forall y \in (-1,1), \quad \frac{e^{-\frac{2L_m}{p-1}}}{C}\kappa(d_i^*(s), y) \le \kappa_1^*(d_i(s), \nu_i(s), y) \le Ce^{2L_m}\kappa(d_i^*(s), y) \tag{C.16}$$

from (i) of Lemma A.2.

(i) Using (C.16), the proof of the continuity of φ reduces to the case where all the $\nu_i = 0$ already treated in (i) of Lemma 3.10 of [17]. As for the identity $q = q_-$, it is obvious by definition (C.12) of q_- and the orthogonality relation (3.31).

(ii) The right-hand inequality follows from (i) of this lemma. It remains then to prove the left-hand side of to conclude.
Clearly, from (C.16), (3.34) and (B.11), the interaction between the solitons in the definition (C.13) of φ can be controlled as in Lemma 3.10 of [17], provided that $L_{m+1} > 0$ is large enough. Therefore, we only give the proof in the case of one soliton and refer to Lemma 3.10 of [17] for the extension to the case of more solitons.
In the case of one soliton, we recall from the definition (C.13) that

$$\varphi(r, \mathbf{r}) = \int_{-1}^{1} \left(r_1' \mathbf{r}_1' (1 - y^2) - \left(p\kappa_1^*(d_i, \nu_i, y)^{p-1} - \frac{2(p+1)}{p-1} \right) r_1 \mathbf{r}_1 + r_2 \mathbf{r}_2 \right) \rho dy.$$

Introducing

$$\varphi_{d_1^*}(r, \mathbf{r}) = \int_{-1}^{1} \left(r_1' \mathbf{r}_1' (1 - y^2) - \left(p\kappa(d_1^*, y)^{p-1} - \frac{2(p+1)}{p-1} \right) r_1 \mathbf{r}_1 + r_2 \mathbf{r}_2 \right) \rho dy,$$

we recall from Proposition 4.7 page 90 in [15] and the orthogonality relation (3.31) that

$$\varphi_{d_1^*}(q, q) \ge \frac{1}{C_1} \|q\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \tag{C.17}$$

where $C_1 > 0$ is independent of d_1^*. Using (i) of Lemma A.2, we see that

$$\varphi(q, q) - \varphi_{d_1^*}(q, q) = p(1 - \lambda_1^{p-1}) \int_{-1}^{1} \kappa(d_1^*, y)^{p-1} q_1^2 \rho dy.$$

Now, if $\frac{|\nu_1(s)|}{1-|d_1^*(s)|} \le \eta_0$, then we see from the definition (3.23) of λ_1 that

$$|\lambda_1 - 1| \le C\eta_0.$$

Therefore, if η_0 is small enough, then we write from (i) of Lemma A.2 and the Hardy-Sobolev inequality (A.1),

$$\varphi(q, q) - \varphi_{d_1^*}(q, q) \ge -C\eta_0 \int_{-1}^{1} q_1^2 \frac{\rho}{1 - y^2} dy \ge -\frac{1}{2C_1} \|q\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2. \tag{C.18}$$

Using (C.17), we get the left-hand side. This concludes the proof of Lemma C.1. ■

C.2 A dynamical study of the equation satisfied by q

We prove Claim 3.8 here. We claim that it follows from the following lemma derived from equation (C.1):

Lemma C.2 *If we fix* L_m *large enough and take* $\epsilon \le \epsilon_6(L_m)$*,* $L_{m+1} \ge L_{m+1,6}(L_m, \epsilon)$ *and* $|x| \le a_6(L_m, \epsilon, L_{m+1})$ *for some* $\epsilon_6 > 0$*,* $L_{m+1,6} > 0$ *and* $a_6 > 0$*, then, for all* $s \in [s_{m+1}, \bar{s}]$*, we have (below,* $C = C(L_m)$*):*
(i) **(Control of the modulation parameters)**

$$\forall i = 1, ..., m, \quad \frac{|d_i'(s)| + |\nu_i'(s) - \nu_i(s)|}{1 - d_i^*(s)^2} \le C\left(\epsilon + \frac{|\nu_i(s)|}{1 - d_i^*(s)^2}\right)\|q(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}} + CJ_m(s)$$

where $J_m(s)$ *is defined in (2.9).*
(ii) **(Control of** $A_-(s) = \varphi(q, q)$**)**

$$\begin{aligned}\left(\frac{1}{2}A_- + R_-\right)' \quad &\le \quad -\frac{3}{p-1}\int_{-1}^{1} q_2^2 \frac{\rho}{1-y^2}dy + C\|q(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2\left(\epsilon + \sum_{i=1}^{m}\frac{|\nu_i(s)|}{1 - d_i^*(s)^2}\right)\\ &\quad +C\|q(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}}J_m(s) + CJ_m(s)^2\end{aligned}$$

where $R_-(s) = -\int_{-1}^{1}\mathcal{F}(q_1)\rho dy$ *with*

$$\mathcal{F}(q_1) = \int_0^{q_1} f(\xi)d\xi = \frac{|K_1^* + q_1|^{p+1}}{p+1} - \frac{|K_1^*|^{p+1}}{p+1} - |K_1^*|^{p-1}K^*q_1 - \frac{p}{2}|K_1^*|^{p-1}q_1^2 \qquad \text{(C.19)}$$

and R_- *satisfies*

$$|R_-(s)| \le C\|q(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}}^{\bar{p}+1} \text{ where } \bar{p} = \min(p, 2).$$

(iii) **(Control of** $\int_{-1}^{1} q_1 q_2 \rho$**)** *Assume that (3.38). Then, we have*

$$\frac{d}{ds}\int_{-1}^{1} q_1 q_2 \rho \le -\frac{7}{10}A_- + CJ_m(s)^2 + C\int_{-1}^{1} q_2^2\frac{\rho}{1-y^2}.$$

(iv) **(A rough estimate)**

$$\left(\frac{1}{2}\|q(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 + R_-\right)' \le C\|q(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 + CJ_m(s)^2.$$

Remark: If we compare this statement with the analogous one in Lemma 3.11 in [17], we see that we have two new features:
- Here, since we allow ν_i to be different from 0, the modulation allows us to kill for each i one additional projection of q, namely $\pi_1^{d_i^*}(q)$ (see (3.31)). As a consequence, we obtain a differential inequality satisfied by all the new modulation parameters ν_i in (i) of Lemma C.2 above;
- If ν_i is small enough so that $\kappa^*(d_i, \nu_i)$ is close to $\kappa(d_i^*)$, then, we expect to get the same bounds as in Lemma 3.11 in [17]. But if $\kappa^*(d_i, \nu_i)$ is far from $\kappa(d_i^*)$, then we expect new

terms to appear in the bounds. As a matter of fact, the distance between $\kappa^*(d_i,\nu_i)$ and $\kappa(d_i^*)$ can be bounded by $\dfrac{|\nu_i|}{1-{d_i^*}^2}$, which is the new term appearing in the bounds above.

Indeed, let us first derive Claim 3.8 from Lemma C.2, then, we will prove the latter.

Proof of Claim 3.8 assuming Lemma C.2: This part is similar to the proof of Proposition 3.8 in [17], when all the $\nu_i = 0$.
Let us introduce for all $s \in [s_{m+1}, \bar{s}]$,

$$\begin{array}{rcl} h_1(s) & = & \frac{1}{2}\|q\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 - \displaystyle\int_{-1}^1 \mathcal{F}(q_1)\rho dy, \\ h_2(s) & = & \frac{1}{2}\varphi(q,q) - \displaystyle\int_{-1}^1 \mathcal{F}(q_1)\rho dy + \eta \int_{-1}^1 q_1 q_2 \rho, \end{array} \tag{C.20}$$

where φ and $\mathcal{F}(q_1)$ are given in (C.13) and (C.19), and η will be fixed small enough. In the following, we will show that Claim 3.8 holds with the above defined functions $h_1(s)$ and $h_2(s)$.

(i) From the definition (C.20) of h_1, (ii) of Lemma C.2 and (3.33), we write

$$|h_1(s) - \frac{1}{2}\|q(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2| \le |R_-(s)| \le C\|q(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}}^{\bar{p}+1} \le \frac{\|q(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}}}{100}$$

if ϵ is small enough, and the first identity in (i) follows.
The second identity of follows then directly from (iv) of Lemma C.2.

(ii) By definition (2.9) of J_m, we write

$$|J_m'| = \frac{1}{p-1}\left|\sum_{i=1}^{m-1}({\zeta_{j+1}^*}' - {\zeta_j^*}')e^{-\frac{1}{p-1}(\zeta_{j+1}^*-\zeta_j^*)}\right| \le \frac{2J_m}{p-1}\sum_{j=1}^m |{\zeta_j^*}'|.$$

Since $\zeta_j^* = -\operatorname{argth} d_j^*$ and $d_j^* = \frac{d_j}{1+\nu_j}$, we write from (i) of Lemma C.2 and (C.15)

$$|{\zeta_j^*}'| = \frac{|{d_j^*}'|}{1-{d_j^*}^2} = \frac{|d_j'(1+\nu_j) - d_j\nu_j'|}{(1+\nu_j)^2(1-{d_j^*}^2)} \le C\left(\frac{|\nu_j|}{1-|d_j^*|} + \epsilon\right).$$

Thus, (ii) follows.

(iii) Assume that (3.38) holds. From the definition (C.20) of h_2, (ii) of Lemma C.2, the coercive estimate in (ii) of Lemma C.1 and (3.33), we write

$$|h_2(s) - \frac{1}{2}A_-(s)| \le |R_-(s)| + \eta\|q(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \le CA_-(s)^{\frac{\bar{p}+1}{2}} + C\eta A_-(s) \le \frac{A_-(s)}{100}$$

if η and ϵ are small enough, and the first identity follows from (ii) of Lemma C.1.
As for the second identity, we write from Lemma C.2 and the first identity

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \left(\dfrac{A_-}{2} + R_-\right)' & \le & -\dfrac{3}{p-1}\displaystyle\int_{-1}^1 q_2^2\frac{\rho}{1-y^2}dy + (\frac{\eta}{5} + C(\epsilon+\eta_0))h_2 + \frac{C}{\eta}J_m^2, \\ \dfrac{d}{ds}\displaystyle\int_{-1}^1 q_1q_2\rho & \le & -\dfrac{7}{10}h_2 + CJ_m^2 + C_1\displaystyle\int_{-1}^1 q_2^2\frac{\rho}{1-y^2}dy \end{array}$$

for some $C_1 > 0$. Therefore, by definition (C.20) of h_2, we write

$$\begin{aligned} h_2' &\le -\left(\frac{3}{p-1} - C_1\eta\right)\int_{-1}^{1} q_2^2 \frac{\rho}{1-y^2}dy - h_2\left[-\frac{\eta}{5} + \frac{7}{10}\eta - C(\epsilon+\eta_0)\right] \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{C}{\eta} + C\eta\right) J_m^2. \end{aligned}$$

Fixing

$$\eta = \frac{3}{(p-1)C_1}, \tag{C.21}$$

we see that fixing $\eta_0(L_m)$ small enough and taking $\epsilon \in (0, \bar\epsilon]$ for some $\bar\epsilon(L_m) > 0$, we get

$$h_2' \le -\frac{2\eta}{5} h_2 + C_2 J_m^2$$

for some $C_2 > 0$. This concludes the proof of Claim 3.8 assuming Lemma C.2. ■

Now, we give the proof of Lemma C.2.

Proof of Lemma C.2: If we set aside (iv), then we see from (C.15), (C.16) and (3.34) that our case is no more than a straightforward adaptation of the case where all $\nu_i = 0$ (hence $\kappa_1^*(d_i(s), \nu_i(s), y) = \kappa(d_i^*(s), y)$ and $d_i^*(s) = d_i(s)$) treated in [17], except for 3 new terms of equation (C.1) : $(0, \bar V_i)$ given in (C.7) and the modulation terms involving $\partial_d \kappa^*$ and $\partial_\nu \kappa^*$. Therefore, we proceed in 4 parts to prove (i), (ii), (iii) and (iv) giving details only for (iv) and the three new terms. The different constants C and C^* below depend on L_m.

Proof of (i): Projection of equation (C.1) on $F_1^{d_i^*}$ and $F_0^{d_i^*}$

We prove (i) of Lemma C.2 here. Fixing some $i = 1, ..., m$ and $l = 0$ or 1, we project in the following each term of equation (C.1) with the projector $\pi_l^{d_i^*}$ defined in (2.1), expanding $\hat L(q)$ as in (C.4).

- Note first that thanks to (C.15) and (C.16), the analysis of Appendix C in [17] holds here and gives the following estimates:

$$\left|\pi_l^{d_i^*}(\partial_s q)\right| \le C\frac{|d_i^{*\prime}|\cdot\|q\|_{\mathcal H}}{1-d_i^{*2}} \le C\frac{\|q\|_{\mathcal H}}{1-d_i^{*2}}(|d_i'| + |\nu_i' - \nu_i| + |\nu_i|),$$

$$\pi_l^{d_i^*}\left(\hat L_{d_i^*}(q)\right) = l\pi_l^{d_i^*}(q) = 0,$$

$$\left|\pi_l^{d_i^*}\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ V_i^* q_1 + R + f(q_1)\end{pmatrix}\right| \le C^*\|q\|_{\mathcal H}^2 + C^*\sum_{j=1}^{m-1} e^{-\frac{2}{p-1}(\zeta_{j+1}^* - \zeta_j^*)} \le C^*(\|q\|_{\mathcal H}^2 + J_m)$$

where J_m is defined in (2.9).

- From (i) of Lemma A.2 and the definition (C.7), we see that $\bar V_i(y,s) = p(\lambda_i^{p-1} - 1)\kappa(d_i^*, y)^{p-1}$ where λ_i is defined right after (C.15). Since we see from the definition

(1.13) and (2.3) of $\kappa(d_i^*,y)$ and $W_{l,2}(d_i^*,y)$ that $W_{l,2}(d_i^*,y)\le C\kappa(d_i^*,y)$, we write from the definition (2.1) of the projector $\pi_l^{d_i^*}$, (A.1) and (i) of Claim A.1,

$$\left|\pi_l^{d_i^*}\begin{pmatrix}0\\ \bar V_i q_1\end{pmatrix}\right| = \left|\int_{-1}^1 W_{l,2}(d_i^*)\bar V_i q_1\rho dy\right| \le C|\lambda_i^{p-1}-1|\cdot\left|\int_{-1}^1\kappa(d_i^*)^p q_1\rho\right|$$
$$\le \frac{C|\nu_i|}{1-{d_i^*}^2}\left(\int_{-1}^1\kappa(d_i^*)^{p+1}\rho\right)^{\frac{p}{p+1}}\left(\int_{-1}^1 q_1^{p+1}\rho\right)^{\frac{1}{p+1}}\le\frac{C|\nu_i|}{1-{d_i^*}^2}\|q\|_{\mathcal H}.$$

- Using Claim 2.2 for the projections of $\partial_\nu\kappa^*(d_j,\nu_j)$ and $\partial_d\kappa^*(d_j,\nu_j)$, we write from equation (C.1) and the above estimate the following (we first project with $\pi_0^{d_i^*}$ then with $\pi_1^{d_i^*}$):

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{|\nu_i'-\nu_i|+|d_i'|}{1-{d_i^*}^2} \quad\le\quad & \frac{C\|q\|_{\mathcal H}}{1-{d_i^*}^2}(|d_i'|+|\nu_i'-\nu_i|+|\nu_i|)+C^*\|q\|_{\mathcal H}^2+C^*J_m\\ &+C\left(\sum_{j\neq i}\frac{|\nu_j'-\nu_j|+|d_j'|}{1-{d_j^*}^2}\right)J_m.\end{aligned}$$

Summing-up this estimate in i and using the smallness of $\|q\|_{\mathcal H}$ and J_m (see (3.33) and (3.34)), we get the conclusion of (i).

Proof of (ii): A differential inequality on $A_-(s)$:
Using equation (C.1), we write

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi(\partial_s q,q) \quad=\quad & \varphi(\hat L q,q)-\sum_{j=1}^m(-1)^j[(\nu_j-\nu_j')\varphi(\partial_\nu\kappa^*(d_j,\nu_j),q)+d_j'\varphi(\partial_d\kappa^*(d_j,\nu_j),q)]\\ &+\varphi((0,R),q)+\varphi((0,f(q_1)),q).\end{aligned}\tag{C.22}$$

Using (C.16), we see that the analysis performed in Appendix C of [17] for the case where all the $\nu_i=0$ holds and gives

$$\begin{aligned}&\varphi(\hat L q,q)=-\frac{4}{p-1}\int_{-1}^1 q_2^2\frac{\rho}{1-y^2}dy,\quad \int_{-1}^1 R^2\rho(1-y^2)dy\le CJ_m,\\ &\int_{-1}^1\kappa(d_i^*,y)|f(q_1)|\rho dy\le C\|q\|_{\mathcal H}^2,\qquad |R_-|\le C\|q\|_{\mathcal H}^{\bar p+1}\end{aligned}\tag{C.23}$$

where $\bar p=\min(p,2)$, $\mathcal F(q_1)$ and J_m are given in (C.19) and (2.9).

- By definition (C.14) and (C.13) of $A_-(s)$ and φ, we write

$$\frac{1}{2}{A_-}'(s)=\varphi(\partial_s q,q)-\frac{p(p-1)}{2}\sum_{i=1}^m(-1)^i(d_i'I_i+\nu_i'\bar I_i)\tag{C.24}$$

where

$$I_i=\int_{-1}^1\partial_d\kappa_1^*(d_i,\nu_i)|K_1^*|^{p-3}K_1^*q_1^2\rho dy\text{ and }\bar I_i=\int_{-1}^1\partial_\nu\kappa_1^*(d_i,\nu_i)|K_1^*|^{p-3}K_1^*q_1^2\rho dy.$$

Using (2.41), (A.1) and (ii) of Lemma C.3 below, we see that

$$|I_i| + |\bar{I}_i| \leq \frac{C}{1-{d_i^*}^2}\int_{-1}^{1}\kappa(d_i^*,y)|K_1^*|^{p-2}dy\|q_1(1-y^2)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}\|_{L^\infty}^2 \leq \frac{C}{1-{d_i^*}^2}\|q\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2. \tag{C.25}$$

Therefore, from (C.24), (i) of Lemma C.2, (3.33) and (3.34), we write

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\frac{1}{2}{A_-}'(s) - \varphi(\partial_s q, q)\right| &\leq C\|q\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2\left(C\sum_{i=1}^{m}\frac{|\nu_i|}{1-{d_i^*}^2} + C\epsilon\|q\|_{\mathcal{H}} + CJ_m\right)\\ &\leq C\|q\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2\left(\epsilon + C\sum_{i=1}^{m}\frac{|\nu_i|}{1-{d_i^*}^2}\right).\end{aligned} \tag{C.26}$$

- Since $|F_{1,l}(d^*,y)| \leq C\kappa(d^*,y)$ by definitions (2.13) and (1.13), using (2.24), (2.26), (2.25), (2.28), (2.32), (2.19) and (2.8), we write

$$\begin{aligned}&(1-{d^*}^2)\left(\|\partial_\nu\kappa^*(d,\nu)\|_{\mathcal{H}} + \|\partial_d\kappa^*(d,\nu)\|_{\mathcal{H}}\right)\\ \leq\ & C + |\nu|\left\|\frac{(1-{d^*}^2)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}}{(1+d^*y)^{\frac{2}{p-1}+1}}\right\|_{L^2_\rho} \leq C + \frac{C|\nu|}{\sqrt{1-{d^*}^2}} \leq C.\end{aligned} \tag{C.27}$$

Therefore, using (i) of Lemma C.1, (i) of Claim A.1, (i) of Lemma C.2 and (3.35), we write

$$\begin{aligned}&\left|(\nu_j-\nu_j')\varphi(\partial_\nu\kappa^*(d_j,\nu_j),q) + d_j'\varphi(\partial_d\kappa^*(d_j,\nu_j),q)\right| \leq \frac{C\|q\|_{\mathcal{H}}}{1-{d_j^*}^2}\left(|\nu_j'-\nu_j| + |d_j'|\right)\\ \leq\ & C\|q\|_{\mathcal{H}}\left((\epsilon + \frac{|\nu_j|}{1-{d_j^*}^2})\|q\|_{\mathcal{H}} + J_m\right) \leq C(\epsilon + \frac{|\nu_j|}{1-{d_j^*}^2})\|q\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 + C\|q\|_{\mathcal{H}}J_m.\end{aligned} \tag{C.28}$$

- Using the definition (C.13) of φ and (C.23), we write

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi((0,R),q) = \int_{-1}^{1}Rq_2\rho dy &\leq \frac{1}{p-1}\int_{-1}^{1}q_2^2\frac{\rho}{1-y^2}dy + C\int_{-1}^{1}R^2\rho(1-y^2)\\ &\leq \frac{1}{p-1}\int_{-1}^{1}q_2^2\frac{\rho}{1-y^2}dy + CJ_m^2.\end{aligned} \tag{C.29}$$

Using the definition of R_- given in (C.23), we write from the definition (C.13) of φ and the equation (C.1) satisfied by q,

$$\begin{aligned}
& R'_- + \varphi((0,f(q_1)),q) = R'_- + \int_{-1}^{1} q_2 f(q_1)\rho dy \\
= \quad & R'_- + \int_{-1}^{1} \partial_s q_1 f(q_1)\rho dy + \sum_{i=1}^{m}(-1)^i d_i' \int_{-1}^{1} \partial_d \kappa_1^*(d_i,\nu_i) f(q_1)\rho dy \\
& +(-1)^i(\nu_i' - \nu_i)\int_{-1}^{1} \partial_\nu \kappa_1^*(d_i,\nu_i) f(q_1)\rho dy, \\
= \quad & \sum_{i=1}^{m} d_i' \int_{-1}^{1} ((-1)^i \partial_d \kappa_1^*(d_i,\nu_i) f(q_1) - \partial_{d_i}\mathcal{F}(q_1))\rho dy \\
& +\nu_i' \int_{-1}^{1} ((-1)^i \partial_\nu \kappa_1^*(d_i,\nu_i) f(q_1) - \partial_{\nu_i}\mathcal{F}(q_1))\rho dy - (-1)^i \nu_i \int_{-1}^{1} \partial_\nu \kappa_1^*(d_i,\nu_i) f(q_1)\rho dy \\
= \quad & \frac{p(p-1)}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{m}(-1)^i d_i' \int_{-1}^{1} \partial_d \kappa_1^*(d_i,\nu_i)|K_1^*|^{p-3}K_1^* q_1^2 \rho dy \\
& +(-1)^i \nu_i' \int_{-1}^{1} \partial_\nu \kappa_1^*(d_i,\nu_i)|K_1^*|^{p-3}K_1^* q_1^2 \rho dy - (-1)^i \nu_i \int_{-1}^{1} \partial_\nu \kappa_1^*(d_i,\nu_i) f(q_1)\rho dy.
\end{aligned}$$

Using (2.41), (ii) of Lemma C.3, (C.23), (i) of Lemma C.2, (3.33) and (3.34), we write

$$|R'_- + \varphi((0,f(q_1)),q)| \le C\|q\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \sum_{i=1}^{m} \frac{|d_i'| + |\nu_i'| + |\nu_i|}{1-{d_i^*}^2} \le C\|q\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \left(\epsilon + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \frac{|\nu_i|}{1-{d_i^*}^2}\right) \tag{C.30}$$

Gathering the estimates (C.22), (C.23), (C.26), (C.28), (C.29) and (C.30), we get to the conclusion of (ii) of Lemma C.2.

Proof of (iii): An additional estimate
Using equation (C.1), we write

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{d}{ds}\int_{-1}^{1} q_1 q_2 \rho dy = \int_{-1}^{1} \partial_s q_1 q_2 \rho dy + \int_{-1}^{1} \partial_s q_2 q_1 \rho dy \\
= \quad & -\sum_{i=1}^{m}(-1)^i \left(d_i' \int_{-1}^{1} \partial_{d_i}\kappa^*(d_i,\nu_i)\cdot(q_2,q_1)\rho dy + (\nu_i' - \nu_i)\int_{-1}^{1} \partial_{\nu_i}\kappa^* \cdot (q_2,q_1)\rho dy \right) \\
& + \int_{-1}^{1} q_2^2 \rho dy + \int_{-1}^{1} q_1(\mathcal{L}q_1 + \psi q_1 - \frac{p+3}{p-1}q_2 - 2y\partial_y q_2 + f(q_1) + R)\rho dy
\end{aligned}$$

where the dot "$\cdot$" stands for the usual inner product coordinate by coordinate.

- Arguing as in pages 112 of [15], we write

$$\int_{-1}^{1} q_2^2\rho dy \le \int_{-1}^{1} q_2^2\frac{\rho}{1-y^2}dy,\quad \int_{-1}^{1} q_1(\mathcal{L}q_1+\psi q_1)\rho dy \le -A_- + \int_{-1}^{1} q_2^2\frac{\rho}{1-y^2}dy,$$

$$\left|-\tfrac{p+3}{p-1}\int_{-1}^{1} q_1q_2\rho dy - 2\int_{-1}^{1} q_1\partial_y q_2\rho dy\right| \le \tfrac{A_-}{100} + C^2\int_{-1}^{1} q_2^2\frac{\rho}{1-y^2}dy,$$

$$\left|\int_{-1}^{1} q_1 f(q_1)\rho dy\right| \le C\|q\|_{\mathcal{H}}^{\bar{p}+1} \le \tfrac{A_-}{100} \text{ where } \bar{p}=\min(p,2).$$

- Using (C.27), the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality and (i) of Lemma C.2, we write

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|d_i'\int_{-1}^{1}\partial_d\kappa^*(d_i,\nu_i)\cdot(q_2,q_1)\rho dy + (\nu_i'-\nu_i)\int_{-1}^{1}\partial_\nu\kappa^*(d_i,\nu_i)\cdot(q_2,q_1)\rho dy\right| \\
\le\ & \left(|d_i'|\|\partial_d\kappa^*(d_i,\nu_i)\|_{\mathcal{H}} + (\nu_i'-\nu_i)\|\partial_\nu\kappa^*(d_i,\nu_i)\|_{\mathcal{H}}\right)\|q\|_{\mathcal{H}} \\
\le\ & \frac{C\|q\|_{\mathcal{H}}}{1-{d_i^*}^2}(|d_i'|+|\nu_i'-\nu_i|) \le C\left(\left(\epsilon+\frac{|\nu_i|}{1-{d_i^*}^2}\right)\|q\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 + J_m\|q\|_{\mathcal{H}}\right) \\
\le\ & A_-\left(\frac{1}{100}+\frac{C|\nu_i|}{1-{d_i^*}^2}\right) + CJ_m^2 \le \frac{A_-}{50} + CJ_m^2.
\end{aligned}$$

- Using (A.1) and (C.23), we write

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{-1}^{1} q_1R\rho dy &\le \left(\int_{-1}^{1} q_1^2\frac{\rho}{1-y^2}dy\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\int_{-1}^{1} R^2\rho(1-y^2)dy\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\le C\|q\|_{\mathcal{H}}\left(\int_{-1}^{1} R^2\rho(1-y^2)dy\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \le \frac{A_-}{10} + CJ_m^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Gathering the above estimates, we conclude the proof of (iii) in Lemma C.2.

Proof of (iv): A rough estimate

Using the definitions (1.10) and (2.2) of $\|q(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}}$ and the inner product ϕ, we write from the equation (C.1) satisfied by q:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{ds}\|q\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 &= \phi(\partial_s q, q) && \text{(C.31)} \\
&= \phi(\hat{L}q,q) - \sum_{j=1}^{m}(-1)^j[(\nu_j-\nu_j')\phi(\partial_\nu\kappa^*(d_j,\nu_j),q) + d_j'\phi(\partial_d\kappa^*(d_j,\nu_j),q)] \\
&\quad +\phi((0,R),q) + \phi((0,f(q_1)),q). && \text{(C.32)}
\end{aligned}$$

- By definition (C.2) and (2.2) of $\hat{L}(q)$ and ϕ, we write

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi(\hat{L}q,q) &= \int(-\mathcal{L}q_1+q_1)q_2\rho dy + \int\left(\mathcal{L}q_1+\psi q_1-\frac{p+3}{p-1}q_2-2y\partial_y q_2\right)\rho dy \\
&= \int(1+\psi)q_1q_2\rho dy - \frac{p+3}{p-1}\int q_2^2\rho dy - 2\int y\partial_y q_2\rho dy.
\end{aligned}$$

Since

$$|\psi(y,s)| \le C\sum_{j=1}^{m}\lambda_j^{p-1} \le Ce^{2(p-1)L_m}$$

by definition (C.3) and the bound (C.15), and

$$-2\int y\partial_y q_2\rho dy = \int q_2^2\left(1-\frac{4y^2}{(p-1)(1-y^2)}\right)\rho dy \le \frac{p+3}{p-1}\int q_2\rho dy - \frac{4}{p-1}\int q_2^2\frac{\rho}{1-y^2}dy$$

from integration by parts, we conclude that

$$\phi(\hat{L}q,q) \le C\|q\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 - \frac{4}{p-1}\int q_2^2\frac{\rho}{1-y^2}dy. \tag{C.33}$$

Since $\phi((0,f(q_1)),q) = \varphi((0,f(q_1)),q)$ by definitions (2.2) and (C.13), we argue as for (C.28), (C.29) and (C.30) and write

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j=1}^{m}(-1)^j[(\nu_j-\nu_j')\phi(\partial_\nu\kappa^*(d_j,\nu_j),q)+d_j'\phi(\partial_d\kappa^*(d_j,\nu_j),q)] \\ & +\phi((0,R),q)+\phi((0,f(q_1)),q) \\ \le\ & C\|q\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 + CJ_m^2 + \frac{1}{p-1}\int q_2^2\frac{\rho}{1-y^2}dy - R_-' \end{aligned} \tag{C.34}$$

where R_- is defined in Lemma C.2. Gathering the information from (C.32), (C.33) and (C.34), we conclude the proof of Lemma C.2. ■

C.3 A table for some integrals involving the solitons

Let us now recall the following result from [17]:

Lemma C.3
(i) Consider $\alpha > 0$, $\beta > 0$, $d_i = -\tanh\zeta_i$, $d_j = -\tanh\zeta_j$ *and*
$I_1 = \int_{-1}^{1}\kappa(d_j)^\alpha\kappa(d_i)^\beta(1-y^2)^{\frac{\alpha+\beta}{p-1}-1}dy$. *As* $|\zeta_i-\zeta_j| \to \infty$, *the following holds:*
if $\alpha = \beta$, *then* $I_1 \sim C_0|\zeta_i-\zeta_j|e^{-\frac{2\beta}{p-1}|\zeta_i-\zeta_j|}$;
if $\alpha \ne \beta$, *then* $I_1 \sim C_0 e^{-\frac{2}{p-1}\min(\alpha,\beta)|\zeta_i-\zeta_j|}$ *for some* $C_0 = C_0(\alpha,\beta) > 0$.
(ii) For any $i = 1,...,m$, $\int_{-1}^{1}\kappa(d_i^*,y)|K_1^*|^{p-2}dy \le C$, *where* K_1^* *is defined in (C.5).*

Proof: See Lemma E.1 in [17]. ■

References

[1] S. Alinhac. *Blowup for nonlinear hyperbolic equations*, volume 17 of *Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and their Applications*. Birkhäuser Boston Inc., Boston, MA, 1995.

[2] S. Alinhac. A minicourse on global existence and blowup of classical solutions to multidimensional quasilinear wave equations. In *Journées "Équations aux Dérivées Partielles" (Forges-les-Eaux, 2002)*, pages Exp. No. I, 33. Univ. Nantes, Nantes, 2002.

[3] S. Alinhac. A numerical study of blowup for wave equations with gradient terms. 2006. preprint.

[4] L. A. Caffarelli and A. Friedman. Differentiability of the blow-up curve for one-dimensional nonlinear wave equations. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 91(1):83–98, 1985.

[5] L. A. Caffarelli and A. Friedman. The blow-up boundary for nonlinear wave equations. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 297(1):223–241, 1986.

[6] C. Fermanian Kammerer, F. Merle, and H. Zaag. Stability of the blow-up profile of non-linear heat equations from the dynamical system point of view. *Math. Annalen*, 317(2):195–237, 2000.

[7] J. Ginibre, A. Soffer, and G. Velo. The global Cauchy problem for the critical non-linear wave equation. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 110(1):96–130, 1992.

[8] M. A. Herrero and J. J. L. Velázquez. Blow-up profiles in one-dimensional, semilinear parabolic problems. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 17(1-2):205–219, 1992.

[9] M. A. Herrero and J. J. L. Velázquez. Blow-up behaviour of one-dimensional semilinear parabolic equations. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 10(2):131–189, 1993.

[10] S. Khenissy, Y Rebai, and H. Zaag. Continuity of the blow-up profile with respect to initial data and to the blow-up point for a semilinear heat equation. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 2010. to appear, doi:10.1016/j.anihpc.2010.09.006.

[11] S. Kichenassamy and W. Littman. Blow-up surfaces for nonlinear wave equations. I. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 18(3-4):431–452, 1993.

[12] S. Kichenassamy and W. Littman. Blow-up surfaces for nonlinear wave equations. II. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 18(11):1869–1899, 1993.

[13] H. A. Levine. Instability and nonexistence of global solutions to nonlinear wave equations of the form $Pu_{tt} = -Au + \mathcal{F}(u)$. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 192:1–21, 1974.

[14] H. Lindblad and C. D. Sogge. On existence and scattering with minimal regularity for semilinear wave equations. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 130(2):357–426, 1995.

[15] F. Merle and H. Zaag. Existence and universality of the blow-up profile for the semilinear wave equation in one space dimension. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 253(1):43–121, 2007.

[16] F. Merle and H. Zaag. Openness of the set of non characteristic points and regularity of the blow-up curve for the 1 d semilinear wave equation. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 282:55–86, 2008.

[17] F. Merle and H. Zaag. Existence and classification of characteristic points at blow-up for a semilinear wave equation in one space dimension. *Amer. J. Math.*, 2010. to appear.

[18] J. J. L. Velázquez. Higher-dimensional blow up for semilinear parabolic equations. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 17(9-10):1567–1596, 1992.

[19] J. J. L. Velázquez. Classification of singularities for blowing up solutions in higher dimensions. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 338(1):441–464, 1993.

[20] J. J. L. Velázquez. Estimates on the $(n-1)$-dimensional Hausdorff measure of the blow-up set for a semilinear heat equation. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 42(2):445–476, 1993.

[21] H. Zaag. On the regularity of the blow-up set for semilinear heat equations. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 19(5):505–542, 2002.

[22] H. Zaag. One dimensional behavior of singular N dimensional solutions of semilinear heat equations. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 225(3):523–549, 2002.

[23] H. Zaag. Regularity of the blow-up set and singular behavior for semilinear heat equations. In *Mathematics & mathematics education (Bethlehem, 2000)*, pages 337–347. World Sci. Publishing, River Edge, NJ, 2002.

[24] H. Zaag. Determination of the curvature of the blow-up set and refined singular behavior for a semilinear heat equation. *Duke Math. J.*, 133(3):499–525, 2006.

Address:
Université de Cergy Pontoise, Département de mathématiques, 2 avenue Adolphe Chauvin, BP 222, 95302 Cergy Pontoise cedex, France.

`e-mail: merle@math.u-cergy.fr`

Université Paris 13, Institut Galilée, Laboratoire Analyse, Géométrie et Applications, CNRS UMR 7539, 99 avenue J.B. Clément, 93430 Villetaneuse, France.

`e-mail: Hatem.Zaag@univ-paris13.fr`